IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAMO Supreme Court No. ____ THE STATE OF IDAHO, Plaintiff-Respondent,) COURT REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT VS THOMAS EUGENE CREECH, Defendant-Appellant. BEFORE HOMORABLE J. RAY DURTSCHI DISTRICT JUDGE APPEAL from the District Court of the First Judicial District of the State of Idaho, in and for the County of Shoshone.

JOHN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705

APPEARANCES

WAYNE KIDWELL, Esq. Attorney General of the State of Idaho, Capitol Building, Boise, Idaho, for and on behalf of the plaintiff-respondent.

BRUCE O. ROBINSON, Esq., Post Office Box 8, Nampa, Idaho, appearing for and on behalf of the defendant-appellant.

la

JOHN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise Idaho 83705

. 1	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE	HE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT
2	OF THE STATE OF IDAHO, IN ANI	D FOR THE COUNTY OF SHOSHONE
3		
4	*	
5		Cr. 316.5
6	THE STATE OF IDAHO,) Cr. No. 2165
7	Plaintiff,) DUDODUTALO UDANCORIDU
8	vs) REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
9	THOMAS EUGENE CREECH,)
10	Defendant.)
11		
12		~
13	BEF	ORE
14	HONORABLE J.	RAY DURTSCHI
15	DISTRIC	T JUDGE
16		
17		
18	BE IT REMEMBERED, That th	e above-entitled matter came
19	on for hearing and trial before	
20	District Judge, with a jury, at	Cascade, Idaho, May 20, 1975
21	through May 22, 1975, and at Wal	lace, Idaho, October 6, 1975
22	through October 22, 1975.	
23		
24		
25		

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	ROBERT REMAKLUS, Esq., Prosecuting Attorney, Cascade, Idaho, and
4	LYNN THOMAS, Esq., Deputy Attorney General, Statehouse, Boise,
5	Idaho, appearing for and on behalf of the plaintiff.
6	Table
7	BRUCE O. ROBINSON, Esq., Post Office Box 8, Nampa, Idaho, appearing for and on behalf of the defendant, and
8	WARD HOWER, Esq., Post Office Box 799, Cascade, Idaho,
9	appearing for and on behalf of the defendant.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	*

· 1	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT
2	OF THE STATE OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SHOSHONE
3	
4	
5	THE STATE OF IDAMO,) Cr. No. 2165
6	Plaintiff-Respondent,) LODGMENT OF COURT
7	VS) REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT) ON APPEAL
8	THOMAS EUGENE CREECH,
9	Defendant-Appellant.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	RECEIVED from John W. Gambee, Official Court Reporter
16	of the above-entitled court, and lodged with me this day
17	of, 1976, original plus copies of
18	the Court Reporter's Transcript on Appeal.
19	
20	
21	CLERK OF THE DISTRICT COURT
22	Chara or and biblious cooks
23	
24	Deputy
25	6

1	WALLACE, IDAHO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1975, 9:30 A.M.
2	(Jurors re-entered the courtroom.)
3	
4	THE COURT: Let the record show the jurors are all
5	present.
6	Call your next witness.
7	
8	MR. REMAKLUS: Call John Stewart.
-	
9	JOHN STEWART,
10	a witness produced on behalf of the State, having been first
11	duly sworn, took the stand and testified as follows:
12	
13	DIRECT EXAMINATION
14	BY MR. REMAKLUS:
15	Q. Will you state your name, please.
16	A. John Lee Stewart.
17	Q. And where do you live, Mr. Stewart?
18	Grangeville, Idaho.
19	O. And what is your age?
20	Eighteen.
21	Are you in school?
22	A. Yeah, I'm a senior.
23	O Down there at Grangeville High School?
24	Yeah.
25	And how long have you lived there at Grangeville?
20	. The man same and a second se

1,887 STEWART, J., Plf., Di. By Mr. Remaklus.

1	. About 16 years.
2	Do you have any part-time jobs in addition to going
3	to school?
4	A. Yeah, I work at Mitchell Texaco and I work for my
5	grandpa during the summer.
6	Q. Now, directing your attention to November 3rd, 1974,
7	were you living in Grangeville on that day?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q And do you happen to remember what you were doing on
10	that day?
11	A. I was working at Mitchell's Texaco pumping gas and
12	checking oil and stuff like that.
13	0 Right there at Grangeville, Idaho?
14	A Right.
15	n And I'm going to ask you to look at a picture how
16	long have you been working at the service station? When did
17	you start working there?
18	A. I started working around in October of '74.
19	Q. Okay. Now, I'm going to hand you State's
20	Exhibit 28-A that's been admitted into evidence. Could you look
21	at that picture, please, Mr. Stewart.
22	(Witness complied.)
23	n Have you seen that automobile that's in that picture?
24	A. Yes, I did.
25	O And when did you first see it?
}	

1	six foot one, had a let's see, weighed about 190 and that's
2	about all I can remember of him.
3	0. And you recognize anyone here in this room as being
4	one of the occupants of that car that night?
5	A. It's the defendant.
6	Q. You are referring to
7	A. Creech.
8	Q the defendant, Thomas Eugene Creech?
9	A. Yeah.
10	Q. Now, did they leave the service station then after
11	their first visit?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Can you give us an idea what time of day that was,
14	John?
15	A. Oh, it was probably about 7:40, somewhere around
16	there.
17	Q. Then did they return to the station?
18	A. Yeah, just as well, I was about ready to close
19	and they pulled in and I had the service station lights out and
20	they wanted to know if they could get some gas and I said yeah.
21	So, I gave them \$5 of gas and they gave me a \$5 bill.
22	Q. Did any of the occupants about what time was
23	that?
24	A. It was right around 8:00. I usually I close at
25	8:00 and remember looking at the time.

1	Q. Um-hmm. And then did they pay you for the gas?
2	A. Yeah.
3	Q. And which one of them paid for the gas?
4	A. The driver did.
5	Q And did you watch them get back into the car?
6	A. No, I didn't because I was well, after I they
7	gave me the money I put it in the "cashier" and by that time I
8	think they drove off so I didn't notice.
9	Q. And what time of day? Could you give us an estimate
10	of the time of day that they drove off?
11	A. Oh, I'd say probably took about ten minutes so it
12	would be about 8:10, something, somewhere around there.
13	Q And this, again, was in the evening; wasn't it,
14	John?
15	A. Right.
16	Q. Was it dark by then?
17	A. Yeah, it got dark around 5:00 in November. So, it's
18	pretty dark.
19	Q. Did you happen to notice which way this car was
20	headed when they left?
21	A. No, I didn't.
22	MR. REMAKLUS: You may examine, Mr. Robinson.
23	
24	
25	

1	pounder that was standing with that girl?
2	A. Yeah, I think
3	Q. The six foot one, 190 pounder didn't have a moustache?
4	A. I can't recall.
5	MR. ROBINSON: I have no further questions.
6	MR. REMAKLUS: I have no further questions.
7	THE COURT: You may step down.
8	THE WITNESS: May I be excused?
9	THE COURT: The witness would like to be excused. Do
10	you have any objection?
11	MR. REMAKLUS: Just be seated for a minute, will you,
12	John. I may have a couple questions on redirect if I may,
13	Your Honor,
14	. (Brief delay.)
15	
16	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
17	BY MR. REMAKLUS:
18	Q. Could you tell us how you recognize the defendant
19	at this time, John?
20	A. I can't recall.
21	Q. Does it look like him?
22	A. Yes, a little bit. It's kind of hard to tell.
23	Q. Are you sure in your own mind this is one and the same
24	man?
25	MR. ROBINSON: Objection, Your Honor, this is

1,894 STEWART, J., Plf., ReDi. By Mr. Remaklus.

1	THE COURT: Sustained.
2	MR. REMAKLUS: I have no further questions. Thank you.
3	
4	MR. ROBINSON: No further questions, Your Honor.
022	THE COURT: Can he be excused?
5	MR. ROBINSON: As far as the defense is concerned.
6	MR. REMAKLUS: Yes.
7	THE COURT: All right. Yes, you may leave, Mr. Stewart,
8	if you want to.
9	Call your next witness.
10	MR. REMAKLUS: Call Ann Bradley.
11	
12	ANN BRADLEY,
13	a witness called on behalf of the State, having been first duly
14	sworn, took the stand and testified as follows:
15	
16	DIRECT EXAMINATION
17	BY MR. REMAKLUS:
18	0. Would you state your name, please.
19	Ann Bradley.
20	Q. And where do you reside?
21	ë. In Boise, Idaho.
22	Q. And are you Mrs. Bradley?
23	A. Yes, I am.
24	0. What is your occupation?
25	A I'm a criminalist with the Idaho Department of
-5	

1,895 BRADLEY, A., Plf., Di. By Mr. Remaklus.

1	A. Yes, I am. I'm a member of the American Association
2	of Forensic Scientists and also the Northwest Association of
3	Forensic Scientists.
4	Q And were you so employed have you been so
5	employed all of this year?
6	A. Yes, I have.
7	Q Did you have occasion to conduct some tests of
8 -	objects in connection with this case?
9	A. Yes, I did.
10	Q. And from whom did you receive such objects and what
11	were they?
12	A. From Mr. Bud Mason.
13	Q. And who is he?
14	A He's with the Department of Law Enforcement. They
15	were two evidence envelopes.
16	Q And do you have those evidence envelopes with you?
17	A. Yes, I do.
18	Q. And could you produce them, please.
19	A. (Witness complied.)
20	Q. Now, Mrs. Bradley, from the time you received those
21	envelopes have you had where have they been?
22	A. They've been either in my personal custody or in our
23	evidence vault at the laboratory.
24	O. And this is under lock and key?
25	A. Yes, it is.

1	Q. Do you know about what date you received the two
2	envelopes?
3	A. Yes, it was the 28th of April of this year.
4	Q. And how were they delivered to you?
5	A. In person by Mr. Mason.
6	Q. Do you have them identified separately by number?
7	A. Yes, they bear one laboratory number but they are
8	called "envelope one and envelope two."
9	Q. Let's refer to envelope number two if you would,
10	please. Is it sealed at this time?
11	A. Yes, it is.
12	Q. And what was the condition of that envelope when
13	you received it?
14	A. It was sealed across the top at the flap but the
15	bottom had not been cut in any way at that time.
16	Q. And how did you did you open it?
17	A. Yes, I did.
18	Q. And how did you open it?
19	A. I opened it at the bottom of the envelope, leaving
20	the original seal intact.
21	Q And when you were through with your testing then
22	what did you do?
23	A. I put the remainder of the evidence, which had not
24	been used, back in the envelope and resealed it.
25	Q. And is it sealed now at the bottom at this time?

1	Q And did you put the seal on the bottom?
2	A. Yes, I did.
3	Q. And is that still intact?
4	A. Yes, it is.
5	Q. Would you open the envelope and remove the contents
6	please.
7	A. (Witness complied.)
8	MR. REMAKLUS: Mark that as State's Exhibit 54, please.
9	(State's Exhibit No. 54 marked for identification.)
10	Q. BY MR. REMAKLUS: Handing you what has been marked
11	for identification as State's Exhibit 54, would you tell us what
12	it is, please.
13	A. Yes. This was a piece of cardboard which was
14	submitted in connection with this case and it has certain stains
15	on it, or discolorations, at any rate.
16	Q. And did you conduct any tests on that, Mrs. Bradley?
17	A. Yes, I did.
18	Q And would you explain what tests that you did
19	conduct?
20	A. I performed the Benzidine Test for blood and also
21	the immunodiffusion tests to try to determine the species of
22	blood.
23	Q. And did you arrive at a conclusion?
24	A. Yes. I felt there was very probably blood as a
25	result of the Benzidine Test but I could not determine the

species of blood; that is, I could not say if it was human or 1 some kind of animal. 2 MR. REMAKLUS: I would offer State's 54, Your Honor. 3 MR. ROBINSON: Same objection, Your Honor, lack of basic 4 5 foundation and at this point testimony does not establish reliability, materiality or relevancy. 6 MR. REMAKLUS: Again, Your Honor, we'll connect this up. 7 THE COURT: All right, it will be admitted subject to 8 being connected up. 9 (State's Exhibit No. 54 admitted into evidence.) 10 MR. REMAKLUS: You may examine, Mr. Robinson. 11 12 CROSS EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. ROBINSON: 14 Q. Mrs. Bradley, other than your examination of those 15 two particular items, do you have any other information 16 particularly about this case, other than what you've just 17 testified to? 18 No, sir, there's certain information on the evidence 19 envelopes which was not placed there by me which I have read, 20 but other than that I have no knowledge of other than what I've 21 testified to here. 22 O. These are the envelopes that you removed the items 23 from? 24 May I approach the witness, please.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. →0940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idano 83705

25

1,902 BRADLEY, A., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

1	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. REMAKLUS:
3	Q. Handing you Exhibits 53 and 53-A, would you be sure
4	that those are in the proper envelopes?
5	A. Yes, they are.
6	Q. And that is which number is that envelope, the
7	brown one?
8	A. The Exhibit is 53 and the brown envelope is 53-A.
9	Q. And what was your number you testified to originally
10	at the top?
11	A. That was called "envelope two".
12	Q All right. Would you put it back together, please.
13	THE COURT: Could I see that just a minute, please.
14	Q . BY MR, REMAKLUS: And would you do the same with the
15	second Exhibits.
16	A. Yes, Exhibit marked 54 in the envelope 54-A is the
17	same Exhibit that originally came out of that envelope.
18	Q. And you had lab number
19	A. I called it "one of " that particular lab number?
20	Q Envelope number one?
21	A. Right.
22	MR. REMAKLUS: Thank you. I have no further questions,
23	Your Honor.
24	MR. ROBINSON: If I may, Your Honor?
25	THE COURT: Yes.

signature and "where received" I filled in "Lab, by A. Bradley, 1 2 16:45." 3 After the analysis my seal was placed with the 4 initials on the front and signature and date on the back. 5 MR. ROBINSON: All right. Thank you very much. 6 I have no further questions, Your Honor. 7 MR. REMAKLUS: Thank you. You may step down. 8 May this witness be excused, Your Honor? 9 MR. ROBINSON: We have no objections, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: You may be excused if you wish to leave, 11 Mrs. Bradley. 12 MR. REMAKLUS: May we have a brief recess prior to 13 calling our next witness, please. 14 THE COURT: Well, all right. 15 If you will remember the admonition, ladies and gentlemen, don't discuss the case and keep your minds open. 16 We will advise you when we're ready to proceed. 17 (Recess taken.) 18 THE COURT: Show the jurors are all present. 19 Call your next witness. 20 MR. REMAKLUS: Call Carol Spaulding. 21 22 23 24 25

1	CAROL MARIE SPAULDING,
2	a witness produced on behalf of the State, having been first
3	duly sworn, took the stand and testified as follows:
4	
5	DIRECT EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. REMAKLUS:
7	O Just have a seat right there.
8	Would you state your name, please.
9	A. Carol Spaulding.
10	Q What is your age, Miss Spaulding?
11	Eighteen.
12	Where have you been residing?
13	The Nevada State Prison.
14	Q. And how long have you been down there?
15	A. Since May.
16	Q. And before that where were you for awhile?
17	A. Idaho State Prison.
18	Q. Now, Miss Spaulding, are you acquainted with the
19	defendant, Thomas Eugene Creech?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. When and where did you meet him?
22	A. Fresno, California.
23	Q. About when was that?
24	A. September, 1974.
25	MR. REMAKLUS: Your Honor, may I question the witness
20	
W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10 Hullandale Drive loise, Idaho 83705	1,908 SPAULDING, C., Plf., Di. By Mr. Remaklus.

1	Q. And where, if anywhere, did you go after you were in
2	Kentucky?
3	n. To Lewiston.
4	And is that Lewiston, Idaho?
5	. Yes.
6	And when was that?
7	. Halloween last year, end of October.
8	O. The end of October?
9	A. Yeah.
10	MR. ROBINSON: Sorry, Your Honor, I didn't hear the
11	reply. I'm sure the jury can't.
12	THE WITNESS: The end of October.
13	Q. BY MR. REMAKLUS: Would that be last year?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. And where did you stay in Lewiston?
16	A. At a hotel and at my mother's house.
17	Q. Did you have occasion to spend the night at your
18	mother's house?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. And what is your mother's name?
21	A. Martha Spaulding.
22	Q. And what is her address?
23	7. 2403 Eighth Avenue.
24	O. There in Lewiston, Idaho?
25	A. Yes.

1,910 SPAULDING, C., Plf., Di. By Mr. Remaklus.

	1	Q And directing your attention or do you know what -
	2	did you stay overnight with your mother?
	3	A. Yes.
	4	Q. And do you know what night you stayed with her?
-	5	A. No.
	6	Q. Did you was Mr. Creech with you at that time?
	7	A. Yes.
-	8	Q. Did he stay at your mother's house also?
	9	A. Yes.
5	10	Q. And directing your attention to the to early
	11	November on the 3rd, the third day of November, were you at
	12	your mother's place in Lewiston?
	13	A. I don't think I was. I could have been.
	14	Q. How long did you stay there in Lewiston?
	15	Approximately a week.
	16	n. And when you left Lewiston where did you go?
	17	3. Towards Boise.
	18	0. How were you traveling?
	19	A. Hitchhiking.
	20	Q. And who were you with?
	21	A. Thomas Creech.
	22	0. And, Miss Spaulding, handing you what
	23	MR. REMAKLUS: May I approach the witness? I think the
	24	Exhibits are up here.
-	25	THE WITNESS: Won't I be able to have a lawyer?

1 THE COURT: Well, if you want to talk to me about it. Do you have some question about that? 2 THE WITNESS: I'd like a lawyer before I finish. 3 THE COURT: Before you go on with your testimony? 4 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 5 THE COURT: Well, we'd better take this up out of the 6 7 presence of the jury. You will be excused, ladies and gentlemen, a brief 8 recess before we take this matter up. If you will remember, 9 don't discuss the case and keep your minds open. The Bailiff 10 will advise you when we're ready to proceed. 11 (Jurors left the courtroom.) 12 MR. ROBINSON: Your Honor, I'm sorry, I was communicating 13 with Mr. Creech and I missed what the Court had said, or what 14 Miss Spaulding said. 15 THE COURT: Miss Spaulding asked me if she couldn't have 16 a lawyer. 17 MR. ROBINSON: I see. Thank you, sir. 18 THE COURT: Can you tell me, Miss Spaulding, on what 19 basis you desire a lawyer? Why you want one? 20 THE WITNESS: I think just because I don't know what to 21 22 say or --THE COURT: Are you concerned that you might incriminate 23 yourself by what you say? Is that what you are concerned about? 24 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you able to hire your own lawyer or do you want me to appoint one?

THE WITNESS: Appoint one, please.

THE COURT: You want me to appoint one?

THE WITNESS: Um-hmm.

THE COURT: Well, Counsel want to participate in this in any way? Any statement Counsel want to make?

MR. REMAKLUS: Well, Miss Spaulding is not charged in this matter and is not a suspect. We see no reason for the appointment of counsel at this time.

THE COURT: Mr. Robinson?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, Your Honor, our investigation of this case brought to my mind approximately two months ago that Miss Spaulding should have counsel and I believe some of the Court's papers that were submitted by the Prosecution made reference to the fact that I had conversation with her and had also recommended -- at that time she was represented by Mr. Michael Lee, a Boise attorney, regarding the custody of Benjamin Allen Spaulding, her son born June the 30th.

Our investigation definitely indicates that Miss Spaulding needs and desperately needs legal advice of her own.

THE COURT: The only basis on which she would need legal counsel, as a witness, would be if she might tend to incriminate herself by her testimony.

25

In what way do you feel she could incriminate herself?

MR. ROBINSON: Her total involvement in the deaths of Arnold and Bradford.

THE COURT: I -- perhaps, since Miss Spaulding wants to, has a question about exercising her rights against self-incrimination, I, perhaps, shouldn't direct any questions to her but let me ask Counsel if my understanding from some knowledge of the records and files of this Court in this case that Miss Spaulding has previously been convicted as an accessory in this case. Is that not correct, Mr. Remaklus?

MR. REMAKLUS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I assume her testimony about her residence in the Nevada Penitentiary and the Idaho Penitentiary were as a result of that conviction; is that correct?

MR. REMAKLUS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Of course, our Idaho Statute, 18-301, is broader than the constitutional double jeopardy provision. Section 18-301 protects prosecution for the same act or omission under any other statute. Double jeopardy, as I understand it, bars a second prosecution for the same offense. Of course, I can see there may be a possibility of a different offense involved under certain testimony Miss Spaulding may give.

But, our statute refers to an act or omission and not the same offense. Any comment on that, Mr. Robinson?

MR. ROBINSON: I will not and cannot represent to the Court regarding the double jeopardy circumstances that may be tuned to Miss Spaulding in regards to Arnold and Bradford and her pleading guilty to accessory. Your Honor, there are many other circumstances out-of-state that will come to light and, basically, we are as interested -- I'm sure the Court is, that Miss Spaulding has competent legal advice. All of this will come into this matter even on cross-examination.

THE COURT: I'm sure we'll be able to delineate her possible incrimination in connection with this case and other cases, perhaps, as to which there hasn't been any proceedings had. Right now I see little difficulty in perceiving that she'll even be required to answer any questions on relevancy and materiality grounds on any other — any other offenses or any out—of—state involvement. I have already indicated to Counsel I'm not going to allow proof on those circumstances in this case.

So, I don't see how I'm going to -- I won't let the Prosecutor ask her any questions about those anyway.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, Your Honor, I'm sure the Court is aware of the intent of the defense on rulings of the Court as to materiality and relevancy on full disclosure and I'm sure the Court is aware of that material covered in the polygraph report wherein, basic information shows that Thomas Eugene Creech did not commit the two murders in the State of Idaho on

Arnold and Bradford which will bear heavily upon the 1 2 materiality and relevancy of the total involvement as to why, 3 then, he did make a voluntary statement. THE COURT: Well, I would just add for the record, that's 4 5 your statement, that's not mine. I don't particularly agree with your statement. I've read the report and I'm not 6 particularly in agreement that that's what it says. It says 7 the operator had some question about his answers on three or 8 four questions, but that is a different statement than the way 9 10 you stated it, Mr. Robinson. 11 MR. ROBINSON: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, under the circumstances I will appoint 12 an attorney, a local attorney here, to consult with 13 Miss Spaulding about her testimony. I'm wondering, to 14 expedite the matter and not delay the trial unduly, are you 15 prepared to go ahead with other witnesses at this time? 16 MR. REMAKLUS: Yes, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: This being Saturday I don't know what --18 where is Miss Spaulding being housed right at this time during 19 20 the --I understand the Kellogg jail. MR. ROBINSON: 21 THE COURT: Is that where you are being kept, at 22 23 Kellogg? 24 THE WITNESS: Yes. 25 MR. REMAKLUS: Yes, Your Honor.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705 1,916 SPAULDING, C., Plf., COLLOQUY.

1 THE COURT: Perhaps I could appoint an attorney that 2 lives in Kellogg, then, so it will be convenient to consult with 3 him. Well, I'll allow Miss Spaulding to be withdrawn as 5 a witness. I'll take care of any further proceedings any 6 Counsel want to take at this time. I want to make clear to Counsel that the only issue 8 I'm concerned about is possible self-incrimination because I 9 think that's the only objection she could make to testifying is 10 that her answer might tend to incriminate her. 11 THE WITNESS: Yeah. 12 THE COURT: And that's the only point I'm going to 13 appoint Counsel to consult with her about; is possible 14 self-incrimination. 15 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 16 THE COURT: You understand that, Miss Spaulding? 17 THE WITNESS: Yes. 18 THE COURT: All right. I'll permit Miss Spaulding to step down and I will appoint counsel. 19 MR. REMAKLUS: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 21 THE COURT: I'll tell the attorney I appoint that you are 22 in the Kellogg jail so he can contact you there, Miss Spaulding. 23 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 24 MR. REMAKLUS: May I consult with co-counsel? 25 THE COURT: Are you ready to proceed and bring the jury

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705 1,917 SPAULDING, C., Plf., COLLOQUY.

=		
	1	back at this time?
	2	MR. REMAKLUS: I think we're ready to proceed,
	3	Your Honor.
4.	4	(Jury re-entered the courtroom.)
	5	THE COURT: Let the record show the jurors are all
_	6	present.
	7	I'll advise you, ladies and gentlemen, I have
Г	8	allowed Miss Spaulding to step down as a witness temporarily and
	9	ask the State to call another witness.
Γ	10	MR. REMAKLUS: Thank you.
_	11	MR. THOMAS: Officer Hill, please.
	12	
_	13	WILLIAM SHERMAN HILL,
-	14	a witness produced on behalf of the State, having been first
F	15	duly sworn, took the stand and testified as follows:
	16	
	17	DIRECT EXAMINATION
_	18	BY MR. THOMAS:
	19	Q. Officer Hill, would you tell the jury your name and
Г	20	address, please?
	21	A. William Sherman Hill, 545 North Elmore, Glenns Ferry
	22	Idaho.
_	23	Q. You are employed as a police officer; is that
1	24	correct?
Γ	25	A. Yes, sir.
HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705		1,918 HILL, W., Plf., Di. By Mr. Thomas.

Γ.			
	1	Q.	Where do you work, Officer Hill?
	2	A.	City Police Officer for the City of Glenns Ferry.
-	3	Q.	Glenns Ferry? That is in Idaho?
	4	A.	Yes, sir.
	5	Q.	How long have you been employed there?
	6	Α.	Approximately three years.
	7	Q.	Were you employed with the Glenns Ferry Police
	8	Department	on the 8th of November, 1974?
	9	A.	Yes, sir.
	10	Q.	What kind of training and background have you had in
	11	law enforc	cement work, Officer Hill?
	12	Α.	I've had on-the-job training and patrol procedures
	13	and invest	igation, handling of complaints and training at the
	14	Post Acade	emy in Pocatello, Idaho.
П	15	Q.	Have you ever before come into contact with the
	16	defendant	in this case, Thomas Eugene Creech?
	17	A.	Yes, sir.
П	18	Q	Do you remember recognize him in the courtroom
L	19	today?	
I	20	ā.	Yes, sir.
11-	21	Q.	Would you point him out, please.
I	22	A.	The person sitting to the right of defense counsel.
Г	23	Q.	To defense counsel's right?
	24	А.	Yes, sir.
	25	Q.	Do you recognize him personally; having seen him
-			

before? 1 Yes, sir. 2 MR. THOMAS: Let the record indicate that Mr. Hill has 3 identified the defendant, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Well, just to make the record clear in this 5 respect, could you describe the clothing he's wearing right now, 6 Mr. Hill? 7 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. He's wearing a brown shirt with 8 brown and white checked pants. 9 THE COURT: Yes, the record may show that the witness 10 has identified the defendant. 11 BY MR. THOMAS: Now, Officer Hill, would you state 12 to the jury when and what circumstances you came into contact 13 with the defendant on November 8, 1974? 14 Yes, sir. I was in Hanson's Cafe, this is between 15 2:00 and 2:15 in the morning on November the 8th. 16 Is that in Glenns Ferry? 17 Yes, sir. At that time I stopped in for a coffee 18 break; which is after checking the business district and I 19 observed two subjects coming to the cafe and order coffee. At 20 that point --21 Would you describe the two subjects, by the way? 22 Yes, sir. One subject was a male subject in his 23 early twenties. He had long hair of a light brown color, gold 24 wire glasses. The other subject was a female, approximately the 25 1,920 HILL, W., Plf., Di. HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R.

By Mr. Thomas.

1

.0940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705

	1	same age with long straight blonde hair and long dark maxi coat.
	2	Q. Had you seen either of those persons in this room
	3	during this trial?
	4	A. Yes, sir, I have seen both of them.
	5	Q. Would you state when?
_	6	A. I saw them yesterday and then the girl this morning.
	7	Q. When you say "the girl this morning" you were
	8	referring to Miss Spaulding who just left the stand?
	9	A. Yes, sir.
	10	Q. She was one of the people you saw?
	11	A. She was yes, sir, she was the female subject.
	12	O. And can you tell the jury who the other person was
-	13	that you saw?
	14	A. The other person was Mr. Rivers who testified
	15	yesterday.
-	16	Q. What happened next, if anything, Officer Hill?
	17	M. Next I noticed that the description that I received
	18	prior on two subjects wanted up north in out of Valley County,
	19	fit the description of these two subjects, Miss Spaulding and
7	20	Mr. Rivers.
1	21	Q. What kind of information did you have from Valley
1	22	County?
-	23	A. The description I received was a young male subject,
	24	young white male subject approximately 20 years of age, long
1	25	dark hair, red beard and a pea coat.
h Maria de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la companya de		

1,921 HILL, W., Plf., Di. By Mr. Thomas.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705

1 The description of the female was a young white 2 female, long blonde hair and a dark maxi coat, approximately 20 years of age. 3 4 Was there any reason why you paid particular attention 5 to Miss Spaulding and Mr. Rivers when they came into the cafe? The cafe was empty at that time of night and they 7 were the only two people. They came in through the door and I 8 naturally observe people who are coming in the cafe that time of night. The fact that they both fit the description that I 9 received earlier, the long blonde hair on the girl and dark 10 maxi coat and with Mr. Rivers it was the long straight hair 11 that he had and his general height and appearance of the two 12 13 subjects. What description had you received earlier about the 14 manner in which the --15 That they were hitchhiking. 16 What description were you given as to what the 17 people you were looking for resembled? 18 Young college couple, apparently college-age, 19 20 traveling. Did the description you received mention blonde hair 21 and the maxi coat that you mentioned a moment ago? 22 Yes, sir, it did mention the long dark maxi coat 23 and long blonde hair. 24 MR. THOMAS: May I approach the witness, Your Honor? 25 1,922 HILL, W., Plf., Di.

By Mr. Thomas.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 0940 Hollandale Drive

Boise, Idaho 83705

경기 그런 서울 선거리와 등(편1177/12/2020)

1 THE COURT: Yes. BY MR. THOMAS: Officer Hill, I'm handing you here 3 what has been marked as State's Exhibit 24. Would you have a 4 look at that and tell me if that resembles the maxi coat you 5 are talking about? 6 A. Yes, sir. 7 After you observed Mr. Rivers and Miss Spaulding 8 what did you do? 9 At that time --10 You can lay the coat over the rail. Q. 11 A. At -- I went to the phone in the back room of the 12 cafe and called the Elmore County Sheriff's office and requested 13 a backup unit to meet me in Glenns Ferry. 14 May I ask why you did that? 15 A. This is procedure on anytime you have a suspect, 16 felony suspect to stop. 17 Why did you suspect there was a felony in this case? 18 Because of the fact that the "twix" had mentioned --A. the teletype that I -- that Mountain Home had given me the 19 20 information from over the radio had mentioned that these two 21 subjects were wanted in Valley County involved with a double 22 homicide. 23 Now, you say you called someone at that point for 24 backup? 25 A. Yes, sir.

1,923 HILL, W., Plf., Di.

By Mr. Thomas.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R.

10940 Hollandale Drive

1 Who did you call? Q. 2 I called the dispatcher, Elmore County Sheriff's office. 3 4 0. Is the dispatcher at the Elmore County Sheriff's 5 office in Glenns Ferry? 6 This is in Mountain Home. 7 0. How far is that from Glenns Ferry? 8 A. Twenty-six miles. 9 And what happened then? Q. 10 I was notified then that there was no available A. 11 County unit for backup to assist me and the stated -- the 12 dispatcher stated there was one State unit on and that the 13 State unit came back on the air hearing our conversation. I was 14 on the phone and he called the State unit and the State unit 15 replied that he was going over and that our State unit officer in Glenns Ferry was much closer and could respond quicker. I 16 was advised to contact a resident State officer in Glenns Ferry. 17 Did you do so? 18 I tried to contact that officer and he was -- I was 19 20 unable to contact him. Then what did you do? 21 At that point I telephoned Officer Menzik's house, 22 another officer in Glenns Ferry and advised him that I had two 23 24 subjects in the cafe that matched the description on the double 25 homicide up north, the subjects wanted for the double homicide 1,924 HILL, W., Plf., Di. HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R.

By Mr. Thomas.

10940 Hollandale Drive

1 and asked him to meet me at Hanson's Cafe. He replied he would. Did you then leave the cafe? 3 I went back into the counter portion and sat back 4 down with my coffee and observed the other two subjects pick up 5 their --That's Mr. Rivers? Mr. Rivers and Miss Spaulding, pick up their coffee 8 and pay for it, their coffee, and doughnut, whatever they had, and 9 then leave through the front door. 10 I allowed them to -- they turned to the right and 11 went back -- there are some big picture windows in the front, and 12 allowed them to get out of sight before I proceeded to my patrol unit so I could observe if they got into a vehicle or 13 left or what manner of transportation they had at the time and 14 where they were going. 15 I observed that, got in my patrol car and I observed 16 a vehicle leaving the parking lot that was parked on the corner 17 by the phone booth. It backed out and left the parking lot, 18 pulled onto First Street and headed east out of town. 19 Q. Was there any other vehicle present in the area at 20 that time? 21 No, sir. We were the only two vehicles. 22 Would you describe the vehicle you saw leaving the 23 24 parking lot? Yes, sir. It was a white over blue Oldsmobile 25 HILL, W., Plf., Di.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive

Boise, Idaho 83705

1,925

By Mr. Thomas.

1,926 HILL, W., Plf., Di. By Mr. Thomas.

1,927 HILL, W., Plf., Di. By Mr. Thomas.

1,928

HILL, W., Plf., Di.

By Mr. Thomas.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R.

10940 Hollandale Drive

1 Not on Mr. Rivers, no, sir. 2 After completing my pat search of Mr. Rivers I asked 3 for identification and he gave me his driver's license. I 4 brought him around and put him on the trunk of the car with his 5 hands on the trunk of the car and his legs spread out so he couldn't move. Then, I proceeded on over and pat searched Mr. Creech and I did notice that he had a pocketknife in his 8 pocket. I did remove this and then pat searched Miss Spaulding 9 and found no weapons other than the pocketknife on Mr. Creech. 10 I asked Mr. Creech for his identification, he gave 11 me a driver's license identifying him as one Joe Carl Adams. 12 Mr. Creech gave you this driver's license? O. 13 Yes, sir. A. 14 And did it have a photo on it? 15 A. Yes, sir. Was it Mr. Creech's photo? 16 At the time, looking at it out there in the 17 intersection with the varied light, I determined -- well, to me 18 it was Mr. Creech at the time. I did not notice any difference 19 in the picture and I asked Miss Spaulding for identification. 20 21 She stated she had none. Was this name you referred to, Joe Carl Adams, on 22 23 the driver's license? 24 Yes, sir. A. 25 I see. Proceed, if you will. HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. HILL, W., Plf., Di. 929

By Mr. Thomas.

10940 Hollandale Drive

- A. I then -- as I said, Miss Spaulding stated she had no identification. At that time Officer Menzik advised the subjects that they were under arrest, we took the three of them back to the patrol car.
 - Q. May I interrupt you here just a second --
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q -- and ask you to tell us, or tell the jury, whether you heard what Officer Menzik said with respect to the subjects being under arrest?
 - A. Yes, sir, I did hear that.
 - Q. Did he state why they were under arrest?
 - A. Stated that they were under arrest for murder.
 - Q. What happened next?
- a. We then took the three of them back to the patrol car and put them in the back seat. I advised all three of them to keep their hands up on the screen which separates the front part from the rear and keep their hands in view. I then called the Mountain Home -- or Elmore County Sheriff's office in Mountain Home and gave them the information of the identification of Mr. Rivers and Mr. Creech and asked -- and the information that Miss Spaulding gave me.
- Q. When you said the identification of Mr. Creech, are you referring to the identification you received from him that said "Joe Carl Adams" on it?
 - A. Yes, sir, and Joe Carl Adams plus verbal information

that Miss Spaulding gave us.

I requested that they run a records check on these and find out if there was any wants or warrants out on them.

After doing that I then advised all three subjects of their rights under the Miranda Warning and they acknowledged positively that they understood their rights under the warning.

- Q Now, would you refer to the Miranda Warnings. Would you explain what that is and what you did about giving those rights?
- A. Yes, sir. That is the rights under the Constitution of a person against violations of certain rights.

 This was on a Miranda Warning card which I read to them.
 - Q. You have a copy of that card with you?
- A. I have a copy of the Miranda Warning, not the specific card.
 - Q. Is it the same as the one you read at that time?
 - A. Yes, sir, it is the same warning and everything.
 - Q. Would you read that to the jury, Officer Hill?
- A. "You have the right to remain silent, anything you say can and will be used against you in a court of law. You have the right to talk to a lawyer and have him present while you are being questioned. If you cannot afford a lawyer one will be appointed to represent you before any questions if you wish. You can decide at any time to exercise these rights and not answer any questions or make any statements.

1 "Do you understand each of these rights I have 2 explained to you? 3 "Having these rights in mind, do you wish to talk to 4 us now?" 5 I asked -- when I asked the question "Do you 6 understand each of the rights I have explained to you" I was 7 acknowledged from all three subjects. 8 Each of them simultaneously gave you an affirmative 9 acknowledgement? 10 I turned around and I -- Miss Spaulding was 11 hesitant on her reply and then she -- I asked her and she 12 stated she did understand her rights. 13 Did Mr. Creech also say that? 14 Yes. 15 Were any questions asked, apart from the questions 16 about identity before these rights were read to the suspects? 17 No, sir. A. 18 What happened next? 19 At that point I got back out of the patrol unit and 20 taking Mr. Rivers out the left-rear door I got him out and had explained to him the circumstances surrounding the reason of 21 22 why we stopped his vehicle; that there had been a homicide, 23 double homicide committed up north and the description fit the 24 subjects and that he could possibly be considered an accomplice 25 and under these circumstances he would be treated as such until

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705 1,932 HILL, W., Plf., Di. By Mr. Thomas.

1 proven otherwise. He stated he understood this and would go 2 along in the manner that we requested and then he got back in his 3 vehicle -- or put him back in the patrol car. 4 After that Officer Menzik asked me -- Rivers if he 5 would give him permission to look in his car and Mr. Rivers stated 6 that he had no objections to this. Officer Menzik went up to 7 Mr. Rivers' car and then came back to the patrol car with a 8 black purse. 9 Now, Mr. Hill, I'm going to display to you State's 10 Exhibit No. 25. Does that appear to be the black purse that 11 you are speaking about? 12 Yes, sir. 13 Q. Go on, please. 14 A. Officer Menzik returned to the patrol car with this 15 black purse and held it up in view of the three subjects in the 16 back seat and asked them who claimed it, who it belonged to. 17 They made no reply as to who the owner of the purse was. 18 He then put it down in the front seat of the vehicle 19 and unzipped it. Lying on the top of the purse was an automatic 20 pistol in a holster. 21 Well, like now, Officer Hill, to show you State's Exhibit No. 22 and ask if you've seen that before? 22 23 Yes, sir. A. 24 And what is that? 0. 25 This is a revolver, .22 caliber revolver that was A.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705 1,933 HILL, W., Plf., Di. By Mr. Thomas.

1,935 HILL, W., Plf., Di. By Mr. Thomas.

1 At that time Officer Menzik -- see, I laid the identification down on the desk and called Mountain Home and 2 requested a -- no, I called Mountain Home and then they 3 notified me that Officer -- Detective Freeman had been advised 4 5 that I requested him to come to Glenns Ferry and he was on his 6 way down. At that time Officer Menzik picked up the 7 8 Joe Carl Adams driver's license off the desk where I had it laying and was looking at it. Then he turned around and stated 9 10 to me that the picture did not match Mr. Creech in appearance. At that point I asked Mr. Creech if that was his driver's 11 license. He stated it was and I asked him what his Social 12 Security number was. He replied that it wasn't his I.D. and it 13 wasn't his driver's license. 14 Did he then tell you what his name was? 15 He then asked me -- I then asked him what his name 16 was and he said it was Tommy Turner. 17 Mr. Creech said that? 18 Yes, sir. I says "You are certain this time"? 19 He says "Yes". I says "This one is your real name, 20 then"? 21 He says "Yes, sir". 22 At that point I contacted Mountain Home again, he 23 gave me a different date of birth -- if I remember correctly, 24 25 and different Social Security number and a different address.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 63705

- 1

1,936 HILL, W., Plf., Di. By Mr. Thomas. I then contacted Elmore County Sheriff's office and requested a records check upon a new name and information that I had received from him.

Q. The name of Tommy Turner?

A. Yes, sir. And we then -- Mr. Menzik then picked up the revolver and removed the clip from the handle, observing that it was fully loaded, and then he ejected one shell out of the chamber of the automatic.

Then, I think it was at that point that we had the three subjects empty their pockets.

Mr. Creech and Miss Spaulding and Mr. Rivers put their property on the desk. Then Mr. Creech had more I.D. in his pocket stating that he was Joe Carl Adams and I think there was about five pieces altogether. I asked him where he had gotten this identification from and he stated that he had gotten it from a man in Boise. I asked him who it was in Boise and he stated it was Jim Marsh.

I asked him where this Jim Marsh lived and he told me he lived -- he gave me the name of the street in Boise in a trailer house just off this street and then I observed that -- and the property was emptied from Mr. Creech's pants that there were approximately four more .22 shells, I think, in his pockets.

Q. Did you ask him about -- or in telling you that he was Tommy Turner, did you ask him what his address was at that

1 or the suspects acknowledge? That all -- I heard him read the rights to them and 3 then handed the form to them. I observed them signing their 4 signatures to them. 5 Go on if you would and describe what then next 6 happened? 7 At that point I informed -- at that point, while he 8 was going through the rights with them, he also produced a 9 consent to search form for Mr. Rivers and read that to 10 Mr. Rivers, getting permission to have his vehicle searched. 11 Mr. Rivers signed the consent to search form, gave 12 him permission, Officer Menzik went out to the car and searched 13 the vehicle. Then I advised -- or Detective Freeman that 14 Jim Maxwell from Valley County wanted to talk to him on the 15 phone. He took the phone and Mr. Menzik came back in with a 16 dark blue coat and requested who the coat belonged to and Mr. Creech identified it as his coat. 17 Then, the -- Detective Freeman asked us to check the 18 clothing for marks or stains of any sort. We -- or Officer 19 20 Menzik and myself went over the dark blue maxi coat here and 21 observed --Did you see here -- is that the dark blue maxi coat 22 23 that you --24 Yes, the one you handed me. We observed that there 25 were some darker stains at the bottom of the coat along the tail

1,940 HILL, W., Plf., Di.

By Mr. Thomas.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R.

.0940 Hollandale Drive

1-5

1,941 HILL, W., Plf., Di. By Mr. Thomas.

F		
june.	1	A. Yes, sir, there is.
Ц	2	Q. What is that?
П	3	A. There's a Q-31.
	4	Q. Q-31? Would you examine the other jacket in the bag,
П	5	ell us about that. Is there a "Q" number on that, first of all?
	6	A. Q-30.
	7	Ø Ø-303
	8	A. Yes, sir.
	9	Q. Is that the other jacket that you were speaking
П	10	bout?
	11	A. Yes, sir.
П	12	Q. And do you have any general, or specific,
_	13	ecollection of where you observed the stains on that jacket?
	14	A. Yes, sir. The stains that we observed were on this
	15	ouff and left sleeve area then, again, on the back in the lower
	16	eack portion here (indicating).
	17	Q. I see. You can return those to the bag if you
	18	ould.
	19	A. (Witness complied.)
	20	Q. Which one, by the way, Officer Hill, did you say
	21	fr. Creech was wearing?
Γ	22	. The Levi jacket.
	23	p. The Levi jacket?
	24	A. Yes, sir.
Γ	25	Q. I believe that was Q-30; wasn't it?
	AN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 0940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705	1,942 HILL, W., Plf., Di. By Mr. Thomas.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive

Boise, Idaho 83705

1,944 HILL, W., Plf., Di.

By Mr. Thomas.

П		
	1	Q. Now, did anybody else become involved in this
	2	investigation after you got to Mountain Home?
	3	A. The only other person that was in there was the
П	4	matron from the Mountain Home Police Department which who did
ī.	5	a complete search of Miss Spaulding. Then we were met in
-	6	Mountain Home by Valley County Deputy Sheriff Jim Maxwell and
H	7	Idaho State Investigator Woodall.
_	8	Q. Woodall?
Н	9	A. Yes, sir.
El .	10	THE COURT: We will take a ten-minute recess at this
-11	11	time.
	12	If you will remember the admonition, ladies and
	13	gentlemen, don't discuss the case and keep your minds open.
	14	(Recess taken.)
П	15	(During the recess State's Exhibits 55 and 56 were
13	16	marked for identification.)
H	17	THE COURT: Show the jurors are all present.
_	18	Q. BY MR. THOMAS: Mr. Hill, if I may go back for just
B	19	a moment I don't think I fully explored with you the search of
П	20	the purse that you were describing awhile back.
Ш	21	Do you know what came out of that? What was found
ī	22	inside?
_	23	A. Basically, yes, sir.
	24	0 What was that?
I	25	A. This was, as I described before, the pistol, T-shirt,
18940 H	GAMBEE, C.S.R. lollandale Drive e, Idaho 83705	1,945 HILL, W., Plf., Di. By Mr. Thomas.

1	being marked?
2	(Brief delay.)
3	THE COURT: Go ahead.
4	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
5	Q BY MR. THOMAS: There is a signature on there that
6	says "Tom Creech". Did you see that attached?
7	A. Yes, sir.
8	Q. And did you see who signed that name on the
9	document?
10	A. Yes, sir.
11	Q. And who was it?
12	A. It was defendant, Mr. Creech.
13	
14	yourself?
15	A. Yes, sir.
16	0. And did anybody else sign it?
17	A. Yes, sir.
18	Q Who was that?
19	A. Wesley Woodall.
20	Mr. Woodall sign in your presence?
21	A. Yes, sir.
22	O. Did Mr. Creech sign in your presence?
23	L. Yes, sir.
24	O. There are several initials which appear throughout
25	the document. Were those placed on the document in your

1,947 HILL, W., Plf., Di. By Mr. Thomas.

1	presence?
2	A. Yes, sir.
3	Q. When was well, let me ask you this: Who put
4	the initials on?
5	A. This was Thomas Creech.
6	Q. When did Mr. Creech sign and initial the document?
7	Do you remember what time of the day that was?
8	A. It was in the I think this was before noon on
9	the same day.
10	Q. Is there a time marked on the document?
11	A. Yes, sir.
12	Q The time of signature?
13	A. According to this it was in the afternoon of
14	4:00 p.m. is when this was signed.
15	Q. Is that in accord with your recollection of the time?
16	A. I was back and forth between the two of them and all
17	I know is that it would have been after Miss Spaulding was
18	taken for arraignment. It would have been about that time, yes,
19	sir.
20	MR. ROBINSON: Your Honor, would you inquire of the
21	alternate juror as to whether or not she's hearing all of the
22	witnesses?
23	THE COURT: Are you able to hear all right?
24	JUROR: Not clearly, no.
25	THE COURT: Speak up a little, then.

	1	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
	2	Q BY MR. THOMAS: Could you describe Mr. Creech's
9	3	demeanor at the time that he signed and initialed that document?
	4	A. Yes, sir.
	5	Q Speak up, please. I can't hear you very
-	6	A. Yes, sir. At the time he was just making the
	7	statements he appeared fairly normal to me.
7	8	MR. THOMAS: No further questions, Your Honor.
1	9	
7	10	CROSS EXAMINATION
	11	BY MR. ROBINSON:
	12	Q. Officer Hill, you completed a total written report,
_	13	official report; did you not, of the occurrences shortly after
	14	your involvement in this case of November 8th, 1974?
	15	A. Yes, sir.
	16	Q. How soon after that date did you complete your
	17	official report?
_	18	A. This was done over the next two days after that.
	19	Q. Would you speak up, please.
-	20	A. Yes, sir. This was done over the next two days
	21	after that.
	22	Q. So, you completed that report on November the 9th
	23	and 10th?
	24	A. To my recollection that's when it was, yes, sir.
	25	Q All right. Now, your recollection tells you what

1,949 HILL, W., Plf., Di. By Mr. Thomas. X. by Mr. Robinson.

1	time of the morning, morning of November 8th did apprehension
2	take place?
3	A. This would have been approximately 2:42 a.m.
4	Q And what is your recollection of your arriving at the
5	Glenns Ferry Police Station?
6	A. It would have been approximately 15 minutes
7	thereafter.
8	Q. All right. Now, before further Officer Hill, do
9	you feel that you could refresh your memory if you had your
10	report handy?
11	A. I possibly could, yes, sir.
12	Q. Do you happen to have that close to you?
13	A. It's in the room.
14	Q. It's in the room?
15	A. Yes, sir.
16	MR. ROBINSON: Your Honor, may he get his official report?
17	THE COURT: If you want to get it, go ahead.
18	(Brief delay.)
19	Q. BY MR. ROBINSON: All right. How long were you at
20	Glenns Ferry Police Department?
21	A. Until sometime after 4:00, probably.
22	Q. I'm sorry.
23	A. I'd say approximately around four, a little after.
24	0. About 4:15; is that what you reported?
25	Approximately that time, I'd say.

1,950 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

1	Q All right. And then you rode in the same car to
2	transport the three subjects to Mountain Home; is that correct
3	A. No, sir.
4	Q or incorrect?
5	A. I was with Mr. Rivers in his vehicle.
6	Q. Oh, all right. And he drove or you drove?
7	A. I drove the vehicle.
- 8	Q. All right. And how long did it take you to get from
9	Glenns Ferry to Mountain Home?
10	A. It's approximately a half hour, 20 minutes to half
11	hour.
12	Q And did you then go directly to the Commissioners'
13	office on the second floor of the Elmore County Courthouse?
14	A. Yes, sir.
15	Q. And this was with all three subjects?
16	A. Yes, sir.
17	Q. And the personal property that you had confiscated;
18	is that correct?
19	A. Yes, sir.
20	Q. And how long did you and all three of the subjects,
21	along with Officer Freeman, or Detective Freeman, remain there
22	in the Commissioners' office?
23	A. After we arrived in the room Detective Freeman
24	requested myself and Officer Menzik to escort Mr. Rivers and
25	Miss Spaulding downstairs to the Sheriff's office.

Π_			
	1	Q.	And did you do so?
Ħ	2	λ,	Yes, sir.
77	3	Q.	And from that point on were the subjects separated?
H	4	Ĕ.	No, sir.
H	5	Q.	Explain to me, Officer Hill, what separation took
-	6	place?	
	7	A.	When separation took place?
П	8	Q.	Yes, and what separation.
	9	A.	Oh
	10	Q.	Who was separated from who?
	11	Α.	At that point Mr. Creech was left upstairs with
	12	Detective 1	Freeman and then I went back upstairs. As he finished
	13	with Mr. C:	reech I took Mr. Creech downstairs and brought
	14	Miss Spaule	ding back upstairs, if I remember right.
	15	Q.	All right. How long was spent in interrogation of
	16	Mr. Creech	before you made this exchange?
	17	A Lie	Oh, approximately 15, 20 minutes.
	18	Q.	All right. Then you took Carol Spaulding back up
	19	to the Comm	missioners' Room?
	20	7.,	Yes, sir.
	21	Q.	And took Tom Creech
	22	Å.	Downstairs.
	23	Ō.	In the basement area of the Sheriff's office?
	24	.ī.	Him and Mr. Rivers were together downstairs.
	25	Ğ	And then how long was Carol Spaulding interrogated?
10940 Ho	GAMBEE, C.S.R. illandale Drive , Idaho 83705		1,952 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

-	1	A. Approximately 15, 20 minutes, half hour.
	2	Q. Were you present during that interrogation?
1	3	A. Yes, sir, I was in and out of the room. I think
	4	once there
	5	Q. And then what happened?
-	6	A. Then I was directed to take Miss Spaulding back
	7	downstairs and return Mr. Creech upstairs; which I did.
1	8	Q. Do you know what time of the day it was then?
	9	A. I'd say this would have been approximately around
	10	7:00.
_	11	Q All right. And then was Tom Creech again questioned
	12	and interrogated?
	13	A. Yes, sir.
	14	Q. For what period of time?
	15	A. I think at this point he was interrogated for
	16	approximately a half hour.
	17	Q. Were you present?
	18	A. Yes, sir.
	19	Q Who else was present?
	20	A. Detective Freeman and I think Sheriff Earl Winters
	21	came into the room at one point and left.
	22	Q. All right. Was anyone else?
	23	A. Not to my recollection.
	24	Q. And you say that session was how long?
	25	A. This would have been approximately a half hour, 45

1,953 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

	1	minutes; something like this.
	2	Q. So, we are at 7:30 a.m. to 7:45 a.m.?
	3	A. Something like this, yes, sir.
	4	Q. Then what happened?
	5	A. Then during this time I was went down and got
	6	a pair of coveralls for Mr. Creech and we did a complete strip
	7	search and removed his clothing and put the coveralls on him and
П	8	then I was instructed to transport him to the Mountain Home
Ш	9	Police Department and return with a police matron to search
	10	Miss Spaulding.
_	11	Q. And did you do so?
	12	A Yes, sir.
П	13	0. What time did you arrive back to the Elmore County
	14	Courthouse?
ī	15	A. It took approximately ten minutes to go over there
	16	and back, probably.
	17	Q. And did you bring the police matron with you?
	18	A. Yes, sir.
E	19	Q. And where was Tom Creech left?
П	20	A. I left him in a cell in the Police Department.
	21	Q. All right. And then what happened?
	22	A. And then the police matron went in and searched
	23	Miss Spaulding and gave me her belongings. I took those back
	24	upstairs to Detective Freeman.
	25	Q. All right. And during this period of time no one

1,954 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

		<u> </u>	And the second of the second o
	1	was being qu	uestioned or interrogated?
	2	А.	No, sir, not to my knowledge. There wasn't anybody
	3	being quest:	ioned.
H	4	Ω.	How about Mr. Rivers?
	5	А.	Mr. Rivers was brought up after I took Miss Spaulding
_	6	clothing up	to her, if I remember right.
	7	Q.	And how long was Miss Mr. Rivers in a session of
П	8	questioning	?
	9	A.	This would have been approximately the same period
Vi	10	of time for	the others.
	11	Ω.	Half hour, 45 minutes?
Ц	12	A.	Yes, sir.
ī	13	Q.	And by whom was he questioned?
П	14	A.	By Detective Freeman.
	15	Q.	And then what happened?
	16	A.	Then he gave us a written statement.
	17	Q	Who gave who a written statement?
	18	Α.	He gave a written statement to Detective Freeman.
Ц	19	Q.	I'm sorry, Officer Hill, I'm having difficulty
	20	keeping you	r voice up where I can
	21	A.	He gave a written statement to Detective Freeman.
	22	Q.	Who is "he"?
П	23	Α.	Mr. Rivers.
	24	Ő	All right. Then what happened?
I	25	A	At that point I think we broke for breakfast, went -
10.1765	IN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 1940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705		1,955 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

1	
1	took Mr. Rivers and Officer Menzik, Detective Freeman,
2	Earl Winters and myself all went over to breakfast.
3	Q. At the El Rancho?
4	A. Yes, sir.
5	Q. That's in Mountain Home?
6	A. Yes, sir.
7	Q. And did the other police officers from Valley
8	County, Officer Maxwell and Wess Woodall from the State join you
9	at that breakfast?
10	A. Yes, sir.
11	Q. Approximately what time was that?
12	A. That would have been approximately between 9:00,
13	9:30, something like this.
14	Q. During this period of time was Carol being held at
15	the Sheriff's office in the Elmore County Courthouse?
16	A. The last I saw her she was in a cell downstairs in
17	the Sheriff's office.
18	Q. And Tom Creech was over at the Mountain Home Police
19	Department in a cell?
20	A. Yes, sir.
21	Q. When was the next questioning period started?
22	A. Okay. We went back to the Elmore County Sheriff's
23	office and upon arrival we took Miss Spaulding upstairs before
24	we went to breakfast we took all the property to the jury room
ι 25	where I had it locked in and that's where we went when we came
HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705	1,956 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

1 back to the jury room, where the property was at that time. And the property you are speaking about is all of 3 this in plastic bags save and except for the blanket and the 4 sleeping bag? 5 Yes, sir. It was everything that we had from our 6 stop in Glenns Ferry. 7 All right. And what time did the continued 8 interrogation, or questioning session with Carol Spaulding start? 9 A. This would have been approximately, say, around 10 10:00, 10:30. It was after we came back from breakfast. 11 All right. And how long did that last? 0. 12 That would have been an hour, probably. A. 13 Were you present during that session? 0. 14 A. Yes, sir. 15 Would you describe to the jury the mannerisms and 16 characteristics of Carol Spaulding during that period of time? 17 Yes, sir. When we first were seated she had set in 18 the chair, she had her feet up in a chair in front of her, folded 19 up in front of her and she repeatedly kept wanting cigarettes 20 and asking for Tom all the time. Every time we asked her a 21question she would seem to ignore the question and stating that 22 she wouldn't say anything until we brought Tom to her, until 23 she could see Tom. 24 Officer Hill, at this time I would assume she was 25 dressed in some prison, or inmate coveralls or something of

1,957

HILL, W., Plf., X.

By Mr. Robinson.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R.

10940 Hollandale Drive

	1	this nature?
	2	A Yes, sir, she had blue coveralls on.
п	3	O. Pardon?
	4	A. I think she had blue coveralls on them.
	5	Q. They were property of the Elmore County Sheriff's
	6	office?
Ш	7	A. Yes, sir.
п	8	O. Since her other belongings had been taken by the
н	9	matron?
П	10	A. Yes, sir.
_	11	All right. Did she use any profanity?
	12	A. Yes, sir.
-	13	Q. Such as what?
Ш	14	A. One time she called us "no good sons of bitches"
П	15	because we wouldn't let Tom come and see her. She told us that
-	16	we were lying to her trying to trick her. Her specific words
	17	only one I can remember for certain was that she kept calling us
	18	"no good sons of bitches" because we wouldn't let Tom see her.
	19	Q. You reported other language that she used in your
П	20	official report; didn't you?
	21	A. That's possible I have it in my report.
П	22	Q. And this is terminology you'd rather not testify
	23	and state here in court yourself, I assume?
	24	A. Well, it would be up to the Court if they wanted to
ī	25	hear it. All I know, I don't remember for sure in my mind what
1.4		
10.0		and the same of th

1,958 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, (daho 83705

By Mr. Robinson.

10940 Hollandale Drive

I.		
	1	point using the cussing and swearing at us. Then she would
Ш	2	fairly well calm down and answer a few questions and then she
П	3	would start in on wanting a cigarette or wanting to see Tom again
ш	4	Q. And was her reaction one of profanity when she was
E	5	refused cigarettes and refused the presence of Tom?
	6	A. Yes, sir.
	7	Q. During that hour session was any statement taken of
П	8	Carol Spaulding?
Li	9	A. There were notes taken.
П	10	Q. Was the session being taped?
	11	A. I remember seeing a tape recorder but I don't know
	12	whether it was on or not.
П	13	Q. Have you since that date been made aware as to
Ц	14	whether or not there was a Cassette or other type of tape made
П	15	of those interrogation sessions?
20-05	16	A Not to my knowledge.
	17	Q. All right. Then from your testimony the session of
П	18	interrogation on Carol Spaulding ended somewhere around 11:00
П	19	a.m. on the 8th day of November, 1974?
П	20	A. That would be approximately, yes, sir.
11	21	Q. Where was she then taken?
	22	A. To my knowledge she was taken back down to the
П	23	same cell she was in prior when we took her out of it to
	24	bring her upstairs.
	25	Q. All right. Was she interrogated any further in
	HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 1940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705	1,961 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

p		
П		
П	1	Mountain Home during the balance of that day?
	2	A. I wouldn't know. I had no further connection with
П	3	her that day.
- 12	4	Q. You did not?
	5	A. No, sir, not that I know of.
	6	Q. But you did participate in the questioning and
Ш	7	interrogation session with Tom Creech that commenced somewhere
П	8	around 2:00 that afternoon?
П	9	A. Yes, sir.
П	10	Q. And that was with Detective Freeman and or,
press.	11	excuse me, Wess Woodall and Officer Maxwell?
H	12	A. Yes, sir.
П	13	Q. Officer Hill, you were present in court this
11	14	morning when Carol Spaulding was brought in, sworn and took
П	15	this witness stand; were you not?
As of	16	A. Yes, sir.
	17	Q. Was that the Carol Spaulding personality that you
п	18	observed on the 8th day of November, 1974?
Ш	19	A. It resembles it, but it's not an absolute expression
П	20	and the way she kind of turns in, you know, away from you when
8.1	21	you are talking to her. She kind of stays to herself more or
П	22	less.
П	23	Q. How about her use of profanity?
И	24	A. As far as that, it's entirely different.
	25	Q All right. Do you have your copy of this official
	IN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 0940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705	1,962 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

П		
_	1	report that you made on the 9th and 10th of November with you
	2	there at the witness stand?
F	3	A. This is a copy, yes, sir.
	4	Q. And you are sure it's an exact copy?
П	5	A. Yeah.
_	6	MR. ROBINSON: May I approach the witness, Your Honor?
	7	THE COURT: Yes.
	8	MR. ROBINSON: May I have this marked, please.
	9	(Defendant's Exhibit H marked for identification.)
П	10	Q BY MR. ROBINSON: That's all one, is it not,
	11	Officer?
	12	A. Yes, sir.
_	13	MR. ROBINSON: Your Honor, we request the admission of
L	14	Defendant's Exhibit H.
	15	MR. THOMAS: May I ask a question in aid of objection,
	16	Your Honor?
П	17	THE COURT: Yes.
_	18	
	19	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
	20	BY MR. THOMAS:
	21	Q. When did you prepare this report, Officer Hill?
П	22	A. This would have been putting it all together
_	23	it would have been over a two-day period following the day that
	24	this occurred.
	25	Q. And did you do it from your recollection or your
	HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 0940 Holiandale Drive Boise, Idaha 83705	1,963 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson. VD by Mr. Thomas.

Π.		
	1	notes or what?
	2	A. Some of it was from recollection and some of it
R	3	was from a few notes that I had.
Ш	4	Q. Is it accurate in every respect?
П	5	A. No. There is one discrepancy in the report that
_	6	was not changed at the time that I had sent copies out to the
	7	State.
П	8	Q. What is that discrepancy?
Ц	9	A. That's
П	10	MR. THOMAS: I withdraw the question.
_	11	I would object just on the basis of the statement
	12	that it is inaccurate and that a proper foundation has not been
-	13	laid.
	14	MR. ROBINSON: If I may, Your Honor, I'll go ahead on
	15	the foundation.
	16	THE COURT: Yes.
	17	
П	18	CROSS EXAMINATION (Continued)
	19	BY MR. ROBINSON:
1	20	Q. Officer Hill, handing you back Defendant's Exhibit H,
	21	would you examine that document and advise us as to what
	22	discrepancy you are referring to?
-	23	A. Okay. This would have been on the eighth page at
	24	the bottom. There's a total of ten pages nine, I think.
	25	MR. ROBINSON: May I again approach the witness,
10940	W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. Hollandale Drive vise. Idaho 83705	1,964 HILL, W., Plf., V.D. By Mr. Thomas. X. by Mr. Robinson.

1,965

HILL, W., Plf., X.

By Mr. Robinson.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R.

10940 Hollandale Drive

November more exactly record and reflect what took place on the 1 2 8th of November more so than what you are testifying today, approximately a year later? 3 Well, some of the testimony is from memory and some 4 of the testimony is from my report because my report doesn't 5 cover everything that was testified to. 6 7 Right. And, so, I'd say that the two of them together would 8 -- both about what I would have to say -- that is, the report 9 would be more exact, probably, than my estimations of time and 10 so forth. 11 MR. ROBINSON: All right. Your Honor, I resubmit the 12 admission of Defendant's Exhibit H. 13 MR. THOMAS: I think the foundation is still improper. 14 We object on that basis; that there has been no showing that 15 this is all the report. 16 THE COURT: Overruled. H will be admitted. 17 (Defendant's Exhibit H admitted into evidence.) 18 THE COURT: We will take our noon recess at this time and 19 you will remember the admonition, ladies and gentlemen, don't 20 discuss the case and keep your minds open. 21 We'll be in recess until 1:30, or as soon as you 22 can get back from there. I understand you have to go to Osburn, 23 I guess it is, for lunch today, so we'll wait until you get back. 24 (Noon recess taken.) 25 1,966 HILL, W., Plf., X. HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R.

By Mr. Robinson.

10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705

Ī	
_ 1	WALLACE, IDAHO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1975, 1:30 P.M.
2	(Jurors re-entered the courtroom.)
3	
4	THE COURT: Show that the jurors are all present.
5	MR, ROBINSON: May I proceed, Your Honor?
6	THE COURT: Yes.
7	
8	WILLIAM SHERMAN HILL,
9	a witness produced on behalf of the State, having been previously
10	duly sworn, took the stand and testified further as follows:
П 11	
12	CROSS EXAMINATION (Continued)
13	BY MR. ROBINSON:
14	Q. Officer Hill, were you present during the entire
15	session of questioning, interrogation that took place, from
16	2:00 p.m. on the 8th day of November, 1974 with
17	Thomas Eugene Creech in Mountain Home?
18	A. No, sir, not for the entire questioning.
19	Q. All right. Were you there at the commencement at
20	approximately 2:00 p.m.?
22	A. I think all except for the first page of his
23	statement is the only part I did not hear him, himself, state.
24	Q. So, the first page of any statement that was taken
25	you were not present but do you know who was? A. Yes, sir.
HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705	1,967 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

1	
1	Q. Who was that?
2	A. That would have been Jim Maxwell, I think.
3	Q. Jim Maxwell?
4	A. Deputy Maxwell.
5	Q. All right. And any other person?
6	A. Mr. Woodall.
7	Q. All right. How long did that session last?
8	A. That was lasted approximately two hours.
9	Q. Until about 4:00 p.m.?
10	A. Yes, sir.
11	Q All right. What pattern or sequence did the
12	interrogation take during the course of that day; commencing at
13	the early a.m. hours after your arrival at Mountain Home
14	Sheriff's office?
15	A. The first person questioned would have been
16	Mr. Creech.
17	Q. All right. And what were the type of questions?
18	A. They were generally on his where he was where
19	he had been on days previous to the time of the arrest, his
20	route of travel to Boise and what occurred at Boise and up
21	until the time that I arrested him.
22	Q. All right. And in his answers to those particular
23	questions, did he give you a general route that was traveled from
24	Lewiston to Glenns Ferry?
25	A. Yes, sir.
HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705	1,968 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

Π		
- 5	1	Q. And dates that he was traveling?
П	2	A. I can't remember if he mentioned any dates or not but
H	3	they were probably there.
- 51	4	Q. All right. Did he advise you of his mode of
	5	transportation?
_	6	A. Yes, sir.
	7	0. And what was that?
П	8	A. Hitchhiking.
П	9	Q Did he tell you who he was with
П	10	5. Yes, sir.
_	11	0 while hitchhiking?
Ш	12	A. Yes, sir.
П	13	Q. Who was that?
Ш	14	A. Miss Spaulding.
П	15	Q. Mention any other persons?
_	16	A. Only other person would have been the people in the
	17	car that cars that gave him rides.
п	18	Q. All right. And did he describe who who did he
П	19	describe that gave him rides?
П	20	A. I could only particular ride and description that
_	21	I can remember is a Mazda, if I remember correctly and it would
	22	have been I think another male and female subject, or
П	23	possibly just one male subject.
Ш	24	Q. All right. You can't remember the exact days that
П	25	he mentioned that he was traveling?
100	HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 0940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705	1,969 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

Ī	17300		
-	1	A.	No, I couldn't state to the exact day which vehicle
ı	2	or where he	was at on a specific date.
ñ	3	Q.	Now, at this commencement were you still
- 22	4	questioning	him as a Tommy Turner?
	5	Α.	Yes, sir.
_	6	Q.	When during the sequence of events of that day
Ц	7	was there an	n identification as to Thomas Eugene Creech?
17	8	A.	There was a suspicion, I would say a likelihood,
211	9	that he was	Thomas Eugene Creech brought out at the time that
П	10	we were in	nterviewing Miss Spaulding.
	11	Q.	This was first mentioned, then, by Carol Spaulding?
	12	A.	No, sir, this was one of the officers had come into
П	13	the office a	and they had been running checks on the description
	14	and so forth	n of Mr. Creech and someone mentioned that this
F	15	subject was	probably Thomas E. Creech.
	16	Q.	Which officer, if you recall?
I	17	A.	I would think it was Mr. Maxwell, Jim Maxwell.
п	18	Q.	And do you know whether or not there had been a
Ц	19	booking prod	cess that had taken place while at the Sheriff's
П	20	office in Mo	ountain Home; both fingerprinting and mugging?
1-3	21	Λ.	I have no recollection of the booking.
	22	Q.	All right. By 2:00 p.m. that afternoon had
П	23	positive ide	entification of Thomas Eugene Creech been made?
Ш	24	A.	I think so.
	25	Q.	And had he advised you and the other officers that
	N W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 940 Hollandale Drivo Boise, Idaho 83705		1,970 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

he was Thomas Eugene Creech? 1 This was during his statement is when I first had 2 A. knowledge that he was Thomas Eugene Creech. 3 All right. O. 4 5 A. For a fact. 6 Now, commencing then with his interrogation, or 7 questioning as Thomas Turner, would you alternately go through who was questioning and how? Okay. As I stated, he was questioned first, then 10 I took him downstairs and brought Miss Spaulding back upstairs. 11 She was questioned in regards to the same questions as Mr. Creech was asked. 12 Specifically what? 13 To where they had been prior to the case, prior to 14 the -- covering this incident and the route of travel and 15 method of traveling. 16 All right. Did their stories coincide? 17 There was some discrepancies in their stories, 18 discrepancies, basically their route of travel and --19 What in particular regarding the route of travel did 20 you interpret as being a discrepancy? 21 Well, they were both -- one was out of state, stated 22 that their route of travel was out of state and the other stated 23 that their route of travel was in-state. 24 Which one stated that they had traveled from 25 Q. 1,971

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive

Boise, Idaho 83705

HILL, W., Plf., X.

By Mr. Robinson.

П.		
П	1	Lewiston, Idaho, to Boise via out-of-state route?
22	2	A. If I remember correctly, it was Creech.
П	3	Q. And what was that route?
111	4	A. Supposedly down through Oregon.
	5	Q. Did he mention any particular towns or cities along
-	6	the way or highways?
Ш	7	A. I can't remember any specific highway nor towns.
П	8	Q. Did he say anything about Pendleton?
Ш	9	A. He may have, but I don't remember for certain what
F	10	town he mentioned, if he mentioned any.
_	11	Q. And what was Carol Spaulding's route through
	12	Idaho?
П	13	A. Yes, sir.
	14	Q. Did she mention communities; basically the ones
П	15	along Highway 95 and 55? Like Grangeville, New Meadows,
	16	McCall?
П	17	A. Yes, sir.
	18	Q All right. Then how did this interrogation, or
	19	questioning, then, continue?
П	20	A. Then I took Miss Spaulding back on downstairs and
	21	returned with Mr. Creech again.
	22	Q. And each time that you would question one or the
-	23	other, would you confront them with discrepancies in their
	24	stories?
B	25	A. These questions were basically brought out by
109	I W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 40 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705	1,972 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

	1	Detective Freeman as to what his intentions were. As far as
11	2	questions were, I don't remember certain what the questions
П	3	were or what their intentions were. But, there were questions
Ц	4	repeated over to try to clear up discrepancies.
F	5	Q. All right. During this period of time how would
_	6	you describe Thomas Creech's condition as to alertness,
	7	fatigue, sleepy; other physical characteristics?
П	8	A. I'd have to say he might have appeared fairly
H	9	normal as far as I can recall.
F	10	Q. Were his eyes bloodshot?
	11	A. I never really noticed whether his eyes were
	12	bloodshot or not.
П	13	Q All right. When, during the course of that day,
H	14	was a written statement obtained from Carol Spaulding?
1	15	A. I have no recollection of a written statement from
	16	Miss Spaulding.
1	17	Q. During the entire day?
п	18	A. Not to my knowledge.
	19	Q. All right. Generally would you describe the
	20	questions propounded and the responses during the questioning
2	21	period from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m
	22	A. Well
	23	Q I'm not asking you for the specific things said,
2	24	but
2	25	A Yes.
HN W. GAMBEE, C 10940 Hollandale Dri Boise, Idaho 8370S	ive	1,973 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

The second

By Mr. Robinson.

10940 Hollandale Drive

1,975 HILL, W., Plf., X.

By Mr. Robinson.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R.

10940 Hollandale Drive

F	
_ 1	Q. And then, at approximately 4:00 p.m. you put
2	your signature on each page?
3	A. Yes, sir.
4	Q. And Officer Woodall put his signature on each page?
5	A. Yes, sir.
6	Q. And was it at that point that Tom Creech was asked
7	to put his signature on each page?
8	A. Yes, sir.
9	Q. And then, in going back through the statements
10	through the pages of the statement, were lines drawn on it and
11	by Officer Woodall, and initialed them by Tom Creech?
12	A. Yes, sir.
13	Q. All of that took place after the entire statement
14	had been prepared?
15	A. As I recall, yes, sir.
16	Q. After the statement itself was prepared, did the
17	interrogation session continue?
18	A. After that I don't remember any further questions
19	being asked.
20	Q. What then did happen?
21	A. At that point we took Mr. Creech and put him in a
22	cell.
23	Q All right.
24	A. And then, that was the extent of it. It was after
25	that that
HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705	1,976 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

1			
_	1	Q. What time did you leave and go back to Gle	enns Ferry?
	2	A. I stuck around for several hours.	*
П	3	Q. Even after Maxwell, Woodall, Creech and Sp	paulding
Ш	4	had departed for transporting to Cascade?	
П	5	A. No, it was approximately the same time the	ey left
-	6	because I helped them load up some of the evidence.	
<u>l</u>	7	Q. And what time was that?	
П	8	A. It was after dark. I couldn't say for cer	rtain.
П	9	This must have been I couldn't even say what time :	it was.
П	10	Q. Do you recall what time you got back to G	lenns Ferry?
-	11	A. No, sir.	
	12	Q Was Carol Spaulding interrogated and ques-	tioned
П	13	again after 4:00 p.m. on the completion of Tom Creech	s session?
U	14	A. Not to my knowledge.	
П	15	Q. If she was, you weren't present?	
	16	A. Yes, sir.	
Ш	17	Q. Officer Hill, were you there when Tom Cree	ech said
П	18	"I need help"?	
П	19	A. No, sir.	
ii ii	20	Q. Were you advised of any part of that?	
	21	A. I had was told that he stated this.	
	22	MR. ROBINSON: May I, Your Honor, have 55 and	56.
П	23	May I approach the witness, Your Honor?	
Н	24	THE COURT: Yes.	
A	25	Q. BY MR. ROBINSON: Officer Hill, handing yo	ou what
HN W. GAMBEE, 10940 Hollandale Di Boise, Idaho 8370	rive	1,977 HILL, W., Plf. By Mr. Robinson	, X.

П.		
-	1.	has been previously marked as State's Exhibit No. 55, I notice
	2	that first page is a typewritten page; is that correct, sir?
П	3	A. Yes, sir, all except for the signatures.
П	4	Q. All except for the signatures and your signature is
Π	5	or is not on that page?
_	6	A. Is not on that page.
	7	Q. Is your signature on the next page that has
П	8	handwritten printing?
Ц	9	A. Yes, sir.
П	10	Q. And is that the information that commenced while
1.7	11	you were present?
1	12	A. This information was given prior to my arrival.
-	13	Q. Prior to your arrival?
H.	14	A. Yes, sir.
П	15	o. All right. Would you look specifically at that
н	16	statement and then testify as to what point in the information
	17	disclosed in that statement that you arrived?
П	18	A. If I remember correctly, it was approximately the
II	19	top of the second page, somewhere on the second page is when I
П	20	came in.
L	21	Q All right, sir, without would you point that out
I	22	to me, specifically as to
	23	A. Seems to me like I remember him stating most of this
11	24	from the top of the page even.
П	25	All right. So, all of the don't fold it over, I
		1 978 HTLT. W. Plf. X.

1.2		
1		
7	1	want to be handed so I could look at it please, Officer Hill.
1	2	And that would be Page 2 of 7 where it commences
1	3	with a crossover sign and a numerical number two; is that correct
	4	A. Yes, sir.
	5	Q. And then I take it your signature was put on the firs
	6	page of that at 4:00 p.m. with Tom Creech acknowledging that
	7	this was his statement?
7	8	A. Yes, sir, this is after I confirmed that is what he
	9	said, that's as far as my acknowledgement went on the first
7	10	page.
-	11	Q. And this is not your printing, is it?
	12	A. No, sir.
-	13	Q. Who was doing the printing?
1	14	A. This would have been Mr. Woodall.
ī	15	MR. ROBINSON: That's all I have, Your Honor.
2	16	MR. THOMAS: No redirect, Your Honor.
	17	THE COURT: You may step down.
7	18	THE WITNESS: May I be excused?
	19	THE COURT: The witness would like to be excused.
7	20	MR. THOMAS: We have no objection.
11	21	MR. REMAKLUS: That's fine.
	22	MR. ROBINSON: No objection.
	23	THE COURT: You may be excused if you want to leave,
	24	then.
П	25	MR. REMAKLUS: Call Officer Menzik.
0940 Holla	MBEE, C.S.R. andale Drive daho 8370S	1,979 HILL, W., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

1		
	1	GEORGE M. MENZIK,
	2	a witness produced on behalf of the State, having been first
	3	duly sworn, took the stand and testified as follows:
	4	
1	5	DIRECT EXAMINATION
_	6	BY MR. REMAKLUS:
	7	Q. Would you state your name, please.
7	8	A. George M. Menzik.
	9	Q. Where do you reside, Mr. Menzik?
1	10	A. Glenns Ferry, Idaho.
1	11	Q. And what is your occupation?
1	12	A. I'm a Deputy Sheriff with the Elmore County
_	13	Sheriff's Department.
	14	Q. And how long have you been employed by the Sheriff's
ī	15	Department?
Ц	16	A. Three days, sir.
	17	Q. What were you doing before that?
	18	A. I was a police officer with the City of Glenns Ferry
	19	sir.
П	20	Q And how long were you a police officer there for
	21	Glenns Ferry?
1	22	A. I was sworn in on June, 1974.
_	23	Q. And have you had prior police experience, Mr. Menzik
	24	A. No, sir, I had not.
	25	Q. Do you have any police training or, let me ask yo
0940 Holl	AMBEE, C.S.R. andale Drive daho 83705	1,980 MENZIK, G., Plf., Di. By Mr. Remaklus.

0940 Hollandale Drive

0940 Hollandale Drive

0940 Hollandale Drive

1 the automobile that you stopped, put his hands on top of the 2 police car, is that right? 3 I'm sorry, on top of his automobile, not the police 4 car. 5 Would you please proceed. 6 Yes, sir. 7 Officer Hill approached the subject from behind and 8 started to search him, pat him down for weapons. At that time 9 I did notice that there was another individual in the automobile. 10 I went over to the passenger side of the car in front, opened 11 the door and stuck the shotgun in the door. Mr. Creech was 12 setting at the window side and Carol Spaulding was sitting in 13 the middle of the car. I advised them then at that time to place their hands on top of their head, step out of the 14 automobile; which they did, and then to place their hands on 15 top of the -- Mr. Rivers' automobile. 16 Were all three of these individuals -- which seat 17 did they get out of? 18 All out of the front seat, sir. 19 Now, is the individual that you referred to as 20 "Mr. Creech" at that time, is he present here in the courtroom? 21 Yes, sir, he is. 22 A. And would you designate who you mean? 23 Yes, sir. He's sitting at the defendant's table, 24 wearing a brown long-sleeved shirt and brown and white checkered 25 1,984 MENZIK, G., Plf., Di. HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 0940 Hollandale Drive

Boise, Idaho 83705

1,985

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive

Bolse, Idaho 83705

MENZIK, G., Plf., Di.

card what he -- is that what he said at that time and place? 1 2 Yes, it was. 3 Okay, please continue. 4 At this time I asked Mr. Rivers if I may look into 5 his automobile and he said to go ahead, he had no objections. 6 I went to the passenger side of his automobile, the 7 door was open where I got them out. On the front floorboard, on 8 the right-hand side of the car I noticed a black handbag. I picked it up, took it in back right to the police car, we have a 9 10 console setting in between the front seat of the police car. I held it up and I asked who it belonged to at this time and 11 12 no one said anything. I asked the second time who it belonged 13 to and Mr. Rivers at this time stated that it wasn't his. 14 I unsipped the bag, it had a sipper on the top, I 15 unzipped the bag and lying on top of the bag was a pistol and a brown holster. 16 I held the bag up from the bottom, I never touched 17 the weapon, I held it up and I said "Who does this belong to?" 18 No one said anything and I asked one more time "Who does this 19 belong to?" No one said a word. I put it back and zipped it 20 back up. 21 At that time I asked Officer Hill how carefully he 22 had searched the suspects and he said he had patted them down 23 but not real good. So, I took the suspects back out of the 24 automobile and patted them down again, put handcuffs on 25

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive

Boise, Idaho 83705

1,987 MENZIK, G., Plf., Di.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive

Boise, Idaho 83705

1,989

MENZIK, G., Plf., Di.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive

Boise, Idaho 83705

1,990 MENZIK, G., Plf., Di.

A		
	1	a sleeping bag and a pea coat-type jacket, dark color, fur
Ш	2	collar with an orange lining in it. I took that and brought it
П	3	right into the Police Station.
В	4	MR. REMAKLUS: May I approach the witness, Your Honor?
fi	5	THE COURT: Yes.
_	6	Q. BY MR. REMAKLUS: Would you open State's Exhibit 47
0	7	please, Officer.
П	8	A. (Witness complied.)
H	9	Q. Officer Menzik, would you describe what you are
П	10	holding at this time?
П	11	A. Yes, sir. A pea coat-type jacket, blue in color,
	12	dark blue with a fur lining and an orange interior.
_	13	Q. And is there a "Q" number on that?
1	14	& Yes, sir, there is.
П	15	0 And what is that?
	16	a. Q-31.
FI.	17	O. And have you seen that coat before, Officer Menzik?
_	18	A. Either this one or a similar jacket, yes, sir.
	19	Q. And when was that?
	20	A. That's the jacket I got out of the police out of
	21	Mr. Rivers' automobile and brought into the Police Station.
П	22	Q On the night in question that we're discussing?
	23	A. Yes, sir.
H	24	Q Okay. Now, would you remove the other contents of
ī	25	the Exhibit.
HN W. GAME 10940 Holland Boise, Idah	ale Drive	1,991 MENZIK, G., Plf., Di. By Mr. Remaklus.

1.3	
1	A. (Witness complied.)
2	Q. Would you describe what you are holding in your
3	hand?
4	A. Levi-type jacket.
5	Q. And would you look and see if there is a "Q" number
6	on that, Officer Menzik?
7	A. Yes, sir, Q-30.
8	Q. And have you seen that coat before?
9	A. Yes, sir, either this or similar jacket. It was
10	the one that Mr. Creech was wearing at the time he was arrested.
11	Q. And that was on the night that we're discussing?
12	A. Yes, sir.
13	Q. All right. Thank you, Officer.
14	Then did you make any inspection of the black bag
15	and the contents thereof at the Glenns Ferry Police Station?
16	A. No, sir, I did not. The weapon was removed from the
17	bag and was laying on the desk. I looked at it at that time, it
18	had a clip in it, we removed the clip and also had a shell in
19	the chamber. The shell was removed from the chamber.
20	Q. Now, handing you what's been marked for
21	identification as State's Exhibit 25, would you look at it
22	carefully, please.
23	3. (Witness complied.)
24	O. Have you seen that object before?
25	A. Yes, sir.
HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705	1,992 MENZIK, G., Plf., Di. By Mr. Remaklus.

П		
II		
	1	Q. And would you describe what it is and tell me where
1	2	you've seen it before?
П	3	A. This or similar bag is the one that was on the front
П	4	floorboard of the Rivers automobile which I removed, brought
I	5	into the police car and then brought into the Police Station.
	6	Q. And when was that?
	7	A. This was on the morning in question, 8th of November
	8	Q. Of 1974?
H	9	A. Yes, sir.
0	10	Q. Thank you.
1.3	11	Handing you what's been marked for identification
	12	as State's Exhibits 22 and 23, would you inspect the same, please
-	13	Officer Menzik.
	14	A. Yes, sir.
T .	15	Q And referring to State's Exhibit 22, can you tell us
2	16	what it is, please?
	17	A Semi-automatic weapon, high standard.
_	18	Q. What caliber?
	19	A22, sir.
1	20	Q. Have you seen that weapon before?
1	21	A. Yes, sir, I have.
Ī	22	Q. And where was that?
-	23	A. This was the weapon that was on top of the bag that
	24	I removed from the automobile, complete.
7	25	Q Do you recognize that as being the one in the same
1		
HN W. GAM 10940 Hollan Boise, Ida		1,993 MENZIK, G., Plf., Di. By Mr. Remaklus.

T		
	1	pistol?
	2	A. Yes, sir, I do.
17	3	Q. Now, when you say "on top of the bag" what time
23	4	or what period of time are you referring to?
П	5	A. Approximately 2:00 a.m., sir, or 2:45.
14,	6	Q. And where were you at that time?
B	7	A. We were up on Highway 30 when I opened the bag and
	8	this weapon was lying right on top.
11	9	Q. And you opened is it the black bag here,
R	10	State's Exhibit 25
11	11	A. Yes, sir, it is.
1	12	Q that you are referring to?
-	13	With reference to the Exhibits 23, Officer Menzik,
13	14	would you tell us what it is and whether or not you've seen it
П	15	before?
	16	A. Yes, sir. It is a brown holster, it's the same
H	17	holster that the weapon was in when it was laying on top of the
_	18	bag, also when it was removed from the bag and setting on the
	19	desk in the Police Station.
П	20	Q. Thank you.
H	21	Officer Menzik, handing you State's Exhibit No. 25-A,
	22	would you look at it, please.
_	23	A. Yes, sir.
H	24	Q Would you tell us what it is and whether or not you
П	25	have seen them before?
H		
10940 Holl	AMBEE, C.S.R. landale Drive Idaho 83705	1,994 MENZIK, G., Plf., Di. By Mr. Remaklus.

П		
Ш	1	A. Two boxes of .22 ammunition. I saw two boxes of
	2	ammunition on the desk in the Police Station.
	3	O. When was that and where?
Ш	4	A. It was in Glenns Ferry Police Station in the morning
П	5	of the 8th of November, 1974.
П	6	Q. Did it appear to be the same kind of shells?
П	7	A. I didn't look at them real close, sir.
	8	Q. Thank you.
Ш	9	You mentioned that there were shells in the clip
п	10	and in the chamber, the pistol, State's Exhibit 22. Did you
Ш	11	unload it, Officer Menzik?
П	12	A. Yes, sir, I took the one out of the chamber.
0-0	13	Q. And what did you do with that?
Ш	14	A. Laid it on the desk, sir.
- 17	15	Q And were there other shells on the desk at that
Ш	16	time?
П	17	A. Yes, sir, there was some loose shells.
	18	Q And is there was there another officer present
11	19	at this time, did you say?
п	20	A. Yes, sir, Officer or Detective Freeman arrived
	21	from Mountain Home approximately 3:40 a.m.
П	22	Q. All right. Did you have any conversation at that
1.3	23	time and place with Mr. Rivers?
	24	A. Not to the best of my knowledge, sir, no, sir.
П	25	Q Did he at that time, did he you have any
13		
	HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 0940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705	1,995 MENZIK, G., Plf., Di. By Mr. Remaklus.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705 1,996 MENZIK, G., Plf., Di. By Mr. Remaklus.

1		
П	1	them to Mountain Home.
Ц	2	Q. And would you describe the positions that the four
	3	of you occupied in the vehicle, please.
100	4	A. All right, sir. Detective Freeman was driving his
	5	automobile, I was in the right-hand passenger side, Carol was
п	6	setting approximately in the middle of the back seat and
Ц	7	Mr. Creech was on the right-hand side. They were close together
П	8	in the back seat.
Ц	9	Q. About how far is it from Mountain Home Glenns Ferry
I	10	up to Mountain Home, Mr. Menzik?
_	11	A. It's approximately 28 miles.
ĬĪ.	12	Q. And could you observe whether or not Miss Spaulding
П	13	and Tom Creech were engaged in conversation during this time?
Ц	14	A. Yes, sir, they were.
Ī	15	Q. Could you tell what they were saying?
_	16	A. No, sir, I could not. They were speaking very
Ш	17	low.
П	18	Q. Do you have any idea how long it took you to
M	19	transport them from Glenns Ferry to Mountain Home, Idaho?
Π	20	A. Approximately 25 minutes.
1.3	21	Q. And where did you go when you got to Mountain Home?
1	22	A. We arrived at the Sheriff's office in Mountain Home
П	23	and the three suspects were taken upstairs and, then,
Ш	24	Mr. Rivers and Carol was taken downstairs to what was then the
П	25	Sheriff's office.
	N W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idahe 83705	1,997 MENZIK, G., Plf., Di. By Mr. Remaklus.

By Mr. Remaklus.

10940 Hollandale Drive

I knew it wasn't Tommy Turner. 1 I want to go back -- first of all, let me ask you 2 this: After you transported the prisoners to Mountain Home, 3 how long did you stay with them? 4 I stayed in the Sheriff's office downstairs 5 approximately -- a little after 9:00. We had had -- we had 6 7 gone out to coffee and had breakfast and I left shortly after we had breakfast. 8 This is 9:00 a.m.? 9 Yes, sir, 9:00, 10:00 a.m., right in there. 10 I'm not sure of the exact time. 11 And then did you return to Glenns Ferry? 12 Yes, sir, I did. 13 Would you please explain, if you can, the appearance 14 and the actions or manner of actions and speech of the 15 defendant when you first saw them out on Highway 30? 16 Yes, sir. Mr. Creech was very quiet, he spoke 17 very low and asked -- any questions that we asked, he went 18 ahead and answered them. He seemed just a little excited at 19 the time, but basically I noticed nothing out of the ordinary. 20 Then, after you got to the Glenns Ferry Police 21 Station and went inside, did you have an opportunity to observe 22 his actions and conduct? 23 Yes, sir, I did. 24 A. And would you explain that, please. 25 Q. MENZIK, G., Plf., Di. 1,999 HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive

Boise, Idaho 83705

By Mr. Remaklus.

By Mr. Remaklus.

10940 Hallandale Drive

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive

Boise, Idaho 83705

2,001 MENZIK, G., Plf., Di.

By Mr. Remaklus.

П		
100	1	And what was that name?
Ш	2	A. Tom Turner.
П	3	MR. REMAKLUS: May Counsel approach the bench for just
П	4	a moment, please, Your Honor?
П	5	THE COURT: Yes.
	6	(Unreported conference between Court and Counsel.)
11	7	MR. REMAKLUS: Mark that as State's Exhibit No. 57.
п	8	(State's Exhibit No. 57 marked for identification.)
Ш	9	Q. BY MR. REMAKLUS: Officer Menzik, I'm handing you
F	10	what's been marked for identification as State's Exhibit No. 57.
1-4	11	Would you inspect that, please.
H	12	A. Yes, sir.
п	13	Q. Would you tell me what it is, please.
Ш	14	A. It's a Notification of Rights form that was given
П	15	to Tommy Turner.
1.12	16	Q. And is that the document that you have been
	17	describing here in your previous testimony?
п	18	a. Yes, sir, it is.
Ш	19	Q. And is there a date appearing on that?
П	20	. Yes, sir, 11-8-74.
	21	Q And did you observe the defendant sign that?
	22	%. Yes, sir, I did.
	23	And what is the signature that appears on there?
	24	I. Tom Turner.
П	25	. And directing your attention to the boxes at the end
-		
	HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 0940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705	2,002 MENZIK, G., Plf., Di. By Mr. Remaklus.

П		
	1	of the questions, are those initialed?
11	2	A. Yes, sir, they are.
П	3	Q And did you observe them being initialed?
11	4	A. Yes, sir, I did.
	5	Q. And by whom were they initialed?
-	6	A. "T.T."
Ш	7	Q. And by whom were they initialed?
Ħ	8	A. Tom Turner.
Ш	9	Q. And who is the individual that you watched did
I	10	you watch the individual affix those initials?
100	11	A. Yes, sir, I did.
Ш	12	Q. And who was that?
17	13	A. Mr. Eugene Creech.
0.1	14	Q Did you happen to observe the name of the other
H	15	witness on there?
_	16	A. Yes, sir, I did.
H	17	Q. And who was that?
	18	A. Jack Freeman.
	19	MR. REMAKLUS: I would offer State's Exhibit 57, Your
П	20	Honor.
	21	MR. ROBINSON: No objection.
	22	THE COURT: Fifty-seven will be admitted.
F	23	(State's Exhibit No. 57 admitted into evidence.)
H	24	MR. REMAKLUS: Pass that around, please.
	25	THE COURT: Mr. Remaklus, I wonder if it wouldn't save

1 time on this to just have you read it into the record for the 2 jury. MR. REMAKLUS: Yes. I'll read it into the record. 3 4 I'm reading Plaintiff's Exhibit 57, "Notification 5 of Rights: Before we ask you any questions, you must understand 6 that you have certain rights under both the Idaho and United 7 States Constitutions. You do not have to talk to us. You have the absolute right to remain silent. Anything you say can and 8 9 will be used against you in Court. You have the right to talk 10 to a lawyer for advice before we ask you any questions and to 11 have the advice and presence of a lawyer even if you cannot 12 afford to hire one. You have the right to request the services of the Public Defender at any time if you cannot afford 13 to hire a lawyer, and such Public Defender will be assigned to 14 represent you at public expense. If you want a lawyer present 15 or if you wish to consult a lawyer, you have the absolute right 16 to remain silent until he is present or has been consulted, 17 whether he be the Public Defender or a lawyer of your own 18 choosing. If you wish to answer questions now without a lawyer 19 present, you have the right to stop answering questions at any 20 time and remain silent. 21 "Waiver: (Place initials at the end of each 22 statement below only after you completely understand what 23 such statement means.) 24 "I have read the above statement of my rights and 25

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive

Boise, Idaho 83705

2,004

READING OF STATE'S

record.

EXHIBIT NO. 57 into

1 I understand and know what I am doing. No promises or threats 2 have been made to me, and no pressure of any kind has been used 3 against me." 4 Signed in ball-point pen "Tom Turner" and there's 5 a blank with the word "Place" written under it and the initials 6 here appear to be "G.F.P.D." 7 Under that the date, "11-8-74". Under that the 8 time "4:17 A.M.". 9 The lower left-hand corner where witnesses 10 "George M. Menzik" and second line "Jack Freeman". 11 Let me check my notes just a moment. 12 You may examine, Mr. Robinson. 13 THE COURT: We will take a ten-minute recess. If you will remember the admonition, ladies and gentlemen, don't 14 15 discuss the case and keep your minds open. . 16 (Recess taken.) THE COURT: I just wanted to make the record reflect 17 that the Exhibit that was marked Exhibit 57 for the trial, was 18 Exhibit 2 in the Suppression Hearing; that has been taken from 19 the Suppression Hearing report and put in evidence in this trial 20 21 as Exhibit 57. MR. ROBINSON: Yes, Your Honor. While we are making 22 that record, Mr. Walker was agreed and stipulated by both the 23 24 State and the Defense to be released and Officer Jim Maxwell 25 needed to return to Cascade, be back about Wednesday and we told

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R.

10940 Hollandale Drive

Boise, Idaho 83705

READING OF STATE'S

record. COLLOQUY.

EXHIBIT NO. 57 into

2,006

1 him there's no problem. 2 THE COURT: Very well. 3 MR. REMAKLUS: So agreed, yes, sir. 4 (Jurors re-entered the courtroom.) 5 THE COURT: Show the jurors are all present. 6 MR. ROBINSON: May I proceed, Your Honor? 7 THE COURT: Yes. 8 9 CROSS EXAMINATION 10 BY MR. ROBINSON: 11 Officer Menzik, would you describe Tom Creech's 12 demeanor as docile, subdued, from the time that you were with 13 him at the Glenns Ferry Police Department through the period of 14 time, about 5:00 a.m. when, as I understand your last contact 15 with him was? 16 He was very quiet, yes, sir. 17 All right. Exhibit any signs of nervousness? 0. 18 Just a little, yes, sir. 19 Well, describe what you saw that you interpreted 20 as signs of nervousness? 21 Well, he -- when we was in the police car 22 originally he had his hands up on the screen and he took them 23 down once or twice. Officer Hill advised him to put his hands 24 up on the screen and he took them down once or twice and when 25 he was sitting in the Police Station he moved around in his chair HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 2,007 MENZIK, G., Plf., X. 10940 Hollandale Drive

Boise, Idaho 83705

By Mr. Robinson.

作人 ときごうがっとうとうしょう しくがん

Π		
-	1	a little and, basically, that was it.
Ц	2	Q. All right. Now, Carol Spaulding, of course, also
H	3	took her hands down from the screen and had to be told also to
E3	4	put her hands back up on the screen several times?
II	5	A. Yes, sir, she did.
-	6	Q. All right. Now, in this ride from Glenns Ferry to
H	7	Mountain Home that you described Carol and Tom sitting in the
Til.	8	back seat having a low-toned conversation; is that the way you
- 113	9	described it?
I	10	A. Yes, sir.
	11	Q. Were you able to overhear any of their conversation?
	12	A. No, sir, I wasn't.
П	13	Q. Was that a continuous conversation from the time you
Ш	14	left Glenns Ferry Police Department until your arrival at
F	15	the Mountain Home Sheriff's office?
_	16	A. Pretty well, yes, sir. They talked quite a bit.
II	17	Q. So, that's for about 25 minutes to a half hour?
П	18	A. Yes, sir.
П	19	Q. And you arrived in Mountain Home there somewhere
II	20	around, between quarter to five and 5:00 a.m.?
1.3	21	A. Yes, sir, we did.
11	22	Q. And you stayed downstairs when Tom was taken
E.	23	upstairs with Jack Freeman and Officer Hill?
H	24	A. Yes, sir, I did.
	25	Q. Now, from that point on did you have any further
10940 Holla	MBEE, C.S.R. andale Drive dahe 83705	2,008 MENZIK, G., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

R	
1	contact with Tom Creech?
2	S part and the state of the sta
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
. 8	
9	
10	
11	
12	attitude, expressed by outward things and overt acts that she
13	did?
14	A. Yes, sir. She bit her lip a lot like she was doing
15	on the stand this morning. She would look from side to side,
16	she swore a lot and she would be very quiet and then she would
17	bust out swearing at me and then she wanted a smoke and I
_ 18	would not give her a cigarette.
19	Q. Did she ever try what you'd call a temper tantrum
20	and bang the cell bars?
21	A. No, sir. I was standing by the bars, she couldn't
22	get to the bars but she did throw a temper tantrum, sir, yes,
23	I would say so.
24	Q. Describe what occurred.
25	A. Well, she would bust out swearing and called me a
HN W. GAMBEE, C.S. 10948 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705	2,009 MENZIK, G., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

1		
	1	few choice names and then she would sit down on the floor.
I	2	
-	3	
Н	4	A. Yes, sir.
П	5	Q. Did she ever completely lay down on the floor?
11	6	A. No, sir.
ī	7	MR. ROBINSON: Your Honor, may I search for a document?
El		THE COURT: Yes.
П	8	(Brief delay.)
1-1	9	MR. ROBINSON: May I approach the witness, Your Honor?
1	10	THE COURT: Yes.
	11	Q. BY MR. ROBINSON: Officer Menzik, handing you
Ш	12	Defendant's Exhibit No. H and turning to that particular page
TI .	13	first of all read to yourself that first paragraph.
11	14	A. (Witness complied.)
ī	15	MR. REMAKLUS: What page are you referring to, Counsel?
21.3	16	MR. ROBINSON: Officer Menzik, would you count exactly
I	17	would you count so that we know which page it is?
-	18	THE WITNESS: Top of Page 8.
Н	19	Q. BY MR. ROBINSON: All right. Have you had an
П	20	opportunity to read that first paragraph?
Ш	21	A. Yes, sir.
Ti .	22	Q. Now, are those the words of profanity and vulgarism
11	23	that were exuded by Carol Spaulding that morning?
1	24	
-	25	A. Yes, sir, they were.
	=0	Q. After 6:00 a.m. did you have any further contact with
HN W. GAMBEE 10940 Hollandale Boise, Idaho 83	Drive	2,010 MENZIK, G., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

П		
211	1	either Tom Creech or Carol Spaulding?
Ш	2	A. No, sir, I did not.
П	3	Q. Did you have further contact with Mr. Rivers?
Ш	4	A. Yes, sir.
	5	Q. What was that? During that period of time at
П	6	breakfast at the El Rancho?
Ш	7	A. Yes, sir.
ń	8	Q. And then what did you do after that breakfast?
23	9	A. I went home, sir, back to Glenns Ferry.
	10	Q. And to this day have you had any further contact
	11	with either Carol Spaulding or Tom Creech?
	12	A. Mr. Creech, yes, sir.
П	13	Q. When and where?
D1	14	A. Last week here in Wallace, sir.
	15	Q. All right. And that's been your appearances here
177	16	as a witness in this matter since the 3rd day of October, 1975;
Ш	17	is that correct?
П	18	A. Yes, sir, last Friday.
Ш	19	Q. Yes.
	20	A. Yes, sir.
	21	Q. And other than your contact with Mr. Creech in
	22	court sessions, has there been any out-of-court contact, you
П	23	and he in any kind of a conference or otherwise?
113	24	A. No, sir.
	25	MR. ROBINSON: I have no further questions, Your Honor.
-		

2,011 MENZIK, G., Plf., X. By Mr. Robinson.

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705

П		
	1	MR, REMAKLUS: You may step down. Thank you.
B	2	THE WITNESS: May I also be excused?
m	3	THE COURT: The witness would like to be excused.
Ш	4	MR. REMAKLUS: He may be so far as the State is concerned.
П	5	MR. ROBINSON: Defense has no objections.
Щ	6	THE COURT: You may leave if you wish to.
П	7	
5-1	8	MR. REMAKLUS: Call Detective Freeman.
	9	JACK FREEMAN,
10	10	a witness produced on behalf of the State, having been first
	11	duly sworn, took the stand and testified as follows:
	12	
П	13	DIRECT EXAMINATION
Ш	14	BY MR. REMAKLUS:
П	15	Q. State your name, please.
	16	A. Jack Freeman.
	17	Q. Where do you live, Mr. Freeman?
_	18	A. Mountain Home, Elmore County, Idaho.
	19	Q. And what is your occupation, please.
П	20	A. I'm a Detective with the Elmore County Sheriff's
	21	Department.
П	22	g. And how long have you been so employed?
_	23	A. Would be, with the Elmore County Sheriff's office,
	24	November the 13th, be four years.
	25	Q. And you have prior experience, Mr. Freeman?
10940 Holl	AMBEE, C.S.R. landale Drive Idaho 83705	2,012 FREEMAN, J., Plf., Di. By Mr. Remaklus.

prior to my retirement.

2

Would you describe it and the duration thereof? Q.

3

Yes, sir. I was Chief Deputy for Elmore -- correction, Owyhee County Sheriff's office for approximately five months.

4 5

Prior to that I was with the Military Police, U.S. Air Force

for 20 years.

7

And have you had any particular special police training; either in the Service or since, Mr. Freeman?

8 9

Yes, sir, I have. Starting with the military, I

10

completed the Military Police School at Camp Gordon, Georgia, this is starting back in '51; with numerous schools and annual

11

proficiency training in all phases of military police work

12 13

throughout the 20 years. Also some college courses through

14

Boise State, which was Junior College at the time. This was

15

16

Then, since I have been out of the military and in civil law enforcement, I've completed the Post Academy that

17 18

is required for State certification in law enforcement.

19

Presently, through training hours that attained, 20 currently eligible for the intermediate certificate. I have

21

attended and completed a school put on by the State for

22

narcotics investigation. I've attended and completed schools

23

put on Federal narcotics, again, for narcotics investigation; another school put on by the State for identification of

24 25

narcotics and numerous other seminars plus fingerprinting school;

defendant signed the form?

- A. Yes, sir, almost immediately after.
- Q Thank you. Now, Mr. Freeman, I'm not sure that I understand the time sequence correctly. But, were the rights given soon after you arrived at the Glenns Ferry Police Station?
- A. Yes, sir, pretty much so. After the discussion as to what had transpired and then keeping in mind too, after my arrival I was on the telephone for a period of time --
 - Q. Before you administered these rights?
 - A. Yes, sir, I believe so.
- Q. Um-hmm. Then, after the rights were given and the sheets signed by the defendant, what, if anything, did you do?
- A. I talked to the defendants, just idle conversation at that particular time, and then a Right to Search was used and George Menzik and -- well, prior to the search, I believe we were asked by the man on the other end of the telephone that identified himself as Jim Maxwell to check particular items of clothing for stains. So, a period of time was taken up checking the clothes and, then --
- Q Could you tell me which clothes you checked for stains?
- A. I didn't really check any of them at that particular point. Patrolman Hill and Menzik was involved in this because we were checking clothes, actually, while I was on the telephone. Mr. Maxwell wanted to know at that time if we

1	found any stains at all. So, I was carrying on a conversation		
2	with him while they were checking.		
3	Q. And were their clothes present at the Police Station		
4	at that time?		
5	A. Yes, sir.		
6	Q. And can you identify those clothes?		
7	A. I believe so.		
8	Q And, handing you what's been marked for identification		
9	as State's Exhibit 24, would you inspect the same, please,		
10	Officer.		
11	Have you seen that coat before?		
12	A. This appears to be the same coat.		
13	Q And does that have a "Q" number marked on it?		
14	A. Yes, sir, it does.		
15	Q. Would you		
16	A. This coat is marked with Q-17.		
17	Q That number was not in it down there that night,		
18	was it?		
19	A. No, sir, not to my knowledge.		
20	Q. Handing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 25,		
21	could you tell me whether or not you've seen that before?		
22	A. Yes, sir, I believe so.		
23	Q. And where did you see that bag before, Officer?		
24	A. This was a black bag that was in the City Police		
25	Station upon my arrival in Glenns Ferry.		

1	to Mr. Maxwell.
2	Q. And how do you identify that as being the identical
3	coat?
4	A. I placed a blue large blue dot under the left
5	collar of this Levi jacket.
6	Q And that dot is still present?
7	A Yes, sir.
8	Q Thank you. Handing you an Exhibit that is marked
9	Q-31, would you inspect that and tell me what it is, please.
10	A. Yes, sir. This is a blue parka-type nylon jacket
11	with a hood, orange lining.
12	Q And do you have anything in your notes about that?
13	A. Yes, sir.
14	Q. Would you consult your notes, please.
15	A. Yes, sir. My initials, "J.F." should be on the
16	back side of the size tag in this garment.
17	Q. Would you please inspect the same.
18	A. Yes, sir.
19	Q. Do your initials so appear?
20	A. Yes, sir, "J.F."
21	Q And where did you first see that coat?
22	A. This is a coat that was handed to me by
23	George Menzik at Glenns Ferry on the morning of the 8th.
24	Q. And do your notes, Officer Freeman, disclose any
25	other items that were handed to you on that date?

A. Yes, sir. This is on an inventory which I believe is fairly complete of all items that I took charge of and ultimately turned over to Mr. Maxwell from the Valley County Sheriff's office.

- Q. And what's the next item your notes disclose?
- A. Well, starting with Item No. 1 is referred to in my notes and an inventory was one pair of black trousers and on these I placed my initials on the left pocket of this with the initials "J.F."

MR. REMAKLUS: If I might have just a moment to consult my notes.

(Brief delay.)

MR. REMAKLUS: I am wondering if Counsel would be willing to stipulate that the trousers are listed in the FBI report as Q-25?

MR. ROBINSON: I'd be willing, if the State's Counsel wants to take the inventory prepared by Mr. Jack Freeman, mark it in evidence and stipulate to its admission that he had a prepared inventory and it will speak for itself and corresponding with the FBI "Q" inventory.

- Q BY MR. REMAKLUS: Do you have such an inventory that we could witness -- photograph and witness it?
- A. The original of this report was given to

 Jim Maxwell for his records at the time that I turned the

 evidence over to him. This is a "burned off" copy.

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q Directing your attention to when you were at the Police Station in Glenns Ferry on the day in question and, if you can remember where I interrupted you to have you enumerate these items of evidence, I'd like to have you continue your narrative of what you did, Officer Freeman.
 - A. I'm sorry, I don't remember.
- Q I think I had asked you if you had given the Miranda Warnings to the three individuals, including the defendant, Mr. Creech.
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And would you tell us what you did, if anything, after that.
- A. Starting in after the Miranda Warnings or starting with --
- Q. Yes, starting after. I think you testified that you gave the Miranda Warnings to all of them.
- A After the Miranda Warnings, really, the only pertinent questions that I can think that I asked, I asked the gentleman that had been identified to me as Tommy Turner, I asked him again what his name was, where he lived. He gave me the name "Tommy Turner" and gave me an address, I believe in Quicksand, Kentucky.

I asked the girl where she lived and to the best of my recollection she gave me an address of her mother's residence

in Lewiston.

Mr. Rivers -- there was some question as to what his address was; whether he had a permanent address of his parents or where he was currently staying and he gave me both of those.

When the stains -- what few stains had been located, when that was relayed to Mr. Maxwell, the rights, went over a few preliminary questions, that's when we decided to transport them to Mountain Home. It was a little bit quieter -- or a little better environment to talk to the people than in a small one-room Police Station.

So, we did transport them to Mountain Home.

- O. And how were the three individuals, Miss Spaulding, Mr. Rivers and Mr. Creech, transported to Mountain Home?
- A. Mr. Creech and Miss Spaulding was placed in the County-marked patrol car; Mr. Creech sitting on the right-rear, fairly close to the girl, with Miss Spaulding sitting more in the middle of the back seat near him.

Mr. Rivers rode up in his own car with Patrolman Hill and that car followed me to Mountain Home.

- Q. Was there anyone with you besides the defendant and Miss Spaulding?
- A. Yes, George Menzik, Patrolman, I had asked him to come along and he was in the right-front passenger seat of my vehicle.
 - 0. And about what time of day -- was this -- or about

were placed in the trunk of the patrol car for transportation to Mountain Home.

- Q And were they transported at the same time and in the same vehicle as the defendant and Miss Spaulding?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q And that was the one being driven by you?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. After you arrived at Mountain Home, where specifically did you go in Mountain Home, Idaho?
- A. We entered Mountain Home off of U.S. -- or
 Interstate 80 and coming into Exit 95, proceeded straight up
 American Legion Boulevard and cut off at the junior high school,
 it's on the corner of Tenth and American Legion, continued down
 and pulled into the Sheriff's office door of the old Courthouse;
 which is a basement-type door.
 - Q And then what did you do, if anything?
- A. We got out of the car, there was other people there. It seems to me like there was other people there to assist us in getting them out of the car; although I can't be positive at that particular time. But, they were taken out of the car, the evidence was -- or the items that had been picked up so far were taken and we proceeded upstairs to the Commissioners' Room; which at that time is one room being on the south end of the Courthouse on the first floor and having a conference table with numerous chairs in it, giving us a good place for

if it was the first time that I talked with Mr. Creech that morning.

I did talk to him twice in the room, Mr. Creech being the first one, and I believe about the last one also that I talked to.

During the course of one of these conversations he advised me --

THE COURT: Just a minute. I'd like to see Counsel at the bench a minute.

(Unreported conversation between Court and Counsel.)

THE COURT: I think we will just take a short recess at this time, ladies and gentlemen. If you'll not discuss the case and keep your minds open and abide by the admonition in all respects.

(Jury left the courtroom.)

THE COURT: I'd just like you to summarize for me, if you can, Mr. Remaklus, just yourself what you -- what testimony you expect this witness to give as to statements by Mr. Creech.

MR. REMAKLUS: Your Honor, I'm going by the statement, the report prepared by Officer Freeman and was introduced in evidence last Friday at the Suppression Hearing as Defendant's Exhibit D. It was my understanding that he testified substantially to the contents of this report. I can ask the witness if I may.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. REMAKLUS:

- Q Officer Freeman, directing your attention to last Friday when we were at the hearing across the street, did you testify as to conversations between you and the defendant at the Courthouse there in Mountain Home?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And what did -- what were the substances of the conversations that you had with him at that place?

Now, I want the ones that you gave us across the street. Can you do that?

A. I believe the only ones that I gave across the street and really the crux and just about the total amount that Mr. Creech gave me was, he was questioned on where he had been during this previous week and this was when he advised that they had been in Spokane and took a route through Eastern Oregon and down to Boise to some friend's house.

Then he went on to describe, you know, who the friend was and where the friend lived.

- Q. And did you testify to this Friday?
- A. I believe I did, sir.

THE COURT: Does that conform to your understanding, Mr. Robinson?

MR. ROBINSON: That far, Your Honor, yes. I even assumed, however, Your Honor, that the testimony about

conversations that this officer participated in would include the final paragraph of his report that was in the Suppression Hearing, our Defendant's Exhibit No. D.

MR. REMAKLUS: May I hand you my copy, Your Honor? THE COURT: Yes.

MR. REMAKLUS: Maybe you'd recognize it.

THE COURT: Now, which paragraph?

MR. ROBINSON: The very last one on that first page, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you agree that that was testified to the other day, Mr. Robinson?

MR. ROBINSON: No, Your Honor, it was not testified to the other day.

THE COURT: I didn't think it was either. What you are saying, then, you are saying that neither one of these were testified to?

MR. ROBINSON: No, Your Honor, the paragraph just above the one the Court just read was testified to. As I recall this final paragraph was not testified to, but I fully expected the testimony of this officer to cover that final paragraph at this time. I find, sequentially, that during the day, the 8th of November, that to keep it in context because I know what the Court's rule was in the Suppression Hearing; that we are going to have the introduction of a statement, the voluntary statement and this is explanatory as to how that was.

1 THE COURT: That hasn't been admitted yet. 2 MR. ROBINSON: No, it hasn't, sir. 3 THE COURT: I'm not going to rule on that until somebody 4 tries to bring that in. But, of course, that wasn't part of 5 that hearing and it will be subject to any new objections that anybody wants to interpose at this point. 7 All right, we'll just take an additional five minutes and then we'll resume. (Recess taken.) 10 THE COURT: If Counsel haven't solved that, I'd make one 11 suggestion. I think, since any foundation for a statement that 12 Mr. Freeman took, if he took one, or got one; oral or 13 otherwise, would involve the same issues that were involved in 14 the Suppression Hearing on Friday, if Counsel are willing to 15 stipulate that the same evidence, as far as foundation could be 16 considered for purposes of any statements Mr. Freeman took, all 17 covered the same time period --18 MR. ROBINSON: Yes, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: -- I would accept that. 20 MR. ROBINSON: I would stipulate that that testimony 21 was given to the Court on the 3rd of October on the Suppression 22 Hearing could be considered by the Court in regards to 23 Mr. Freeman's contact with Tom Creech on the 8th day -- the

morning a.m. of the 8th day of November.

THE COURT: That would avoid having to repeat all that

24

foundation testimony on voluntariness.

MR. REMAKLUS: Yes, the State would so stipulate, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I think all I would require, then, is have you make an offer of proof as to exactly what statement he's going to make and then I'll rule on the voluntariness of that.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. REMAKLUS:

Q. Mr. Freeman, just before our recess I had asked you to repeat, as closely as you could, the conversation you had with Tom Creech on the 8th day of November, 1974 at the Mountain Home -- or Elmore County Courthouse.

- A. Are you ready for an answer now?
- O. Yes.

A. I'm sorry. Yes, at the basics of that conversation was as pertain to the week during the week that the 8th fell on and I was advised by Mr. Creech that they had been in Spokane and him and Carol had been hitchhiking. They caught a ride to Boise, they received only one ride and come by way of Eastern Oregon.

Q And did you overhear any conversations later on that same day between Officers Maxwell and Woodall and the defendant, Thomas Creech?

1 stipulation that I can consider the record on the Motion to 2 Suppress the -- which was heard in connection with, I take it, what has now been marked for this trial as Exhibit 55, is that 3 4 right? 5 MR. ROBINSON: Yes, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: With that foundation I would rule that this 7 statement was also voluntary and competently made and after the 8 defendant had been adequately advised of his rights and 9 overrule the objection. 10 MR. ROBINSON: Your Honor, before you call the jury in, 11 could I step forward and get this Exhibit and take a quick 12 look at it? I have a question in my mind, it's right here. 13 THE COURT: Yes. 14 MR. ROBINSON: Fifty-five, I believe, and 56. 15 THE COURT: I think that's 55, yes. 16 MR. ROBINSON: Your Honor, may I deliver this to the Court and --17 18 THE COURT: If it's the same statement we had the other day, I have a copy here. 19 20 MR. ROBINSON: Yes, this is the one that's marked as Exhibit 55 and 56, Your Honor, just the first pages of 55. The 21 22 second page is 56, it contains -- and it has not been excised 23 in conformity, of course, with the Court's ruling during the 24 Motion of Suppression.

25

It contains, and still contains, all of the

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. REMAKLUS:

Q Officer Freeman, just before the recess I'd asked you whether or not you had a conversation there at Mountain Home with the defendant, Tom Creech, and I had asked you -- you said that you had.

Now, would you tell us as much of that conversation as you recall?

A. Yes, sir. The conversation was held with Mr. Creech during the interview on the morning of the 8th and the basics of the questions that I asked him was as pertained to where he was during the earlier part of the week of the 8th.

Mr. Creech advised me that him and Carol had been in Spokane, they had departed Spokane, I believe on Monday evening hitchhiking and had gotten one ride from that area into Boise and that they had came by way of Eastern Oregon and then had stayed in Boise with some friends.

Q. Now, Officer Freeman, I want to go back for when you first arrived at Mountain Home -- excuse me, at Glenns Ferry and met the defendant.

I would like for you to describe, as best you can, his actions and demeanor as you observed him at Glenns Ferry, Idaho.

A. His actions and demeanor, as far as I remember, he was nervous to the point that we find quite regular among people

Not that I recall, sir.

loudly is what I'm getting at?

And were there any noises in the car? Anyone talking

23

24

BY MR. ROBINSON:

4 5 6

9

7

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Officer Freeman, it's my understanding that you had conversations, then, the early A.M. hours with both Tom Creech and Carol Spaulding at Glenns Ferry, were with them during transporting from Glenns Ferry to Mountain Home and short conversation with Tom Creech after arriving in Mountain Home; is that correct?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q Approximately how long was that conversation with Tom at Mountain Home?
- A. These conversations at Mountain Home was like the one in Glenns Ferry, they weren't very long in duration because we were figuring, oh, I would say maximum time spent with all three individuals that were picked up, from the time we arrived at Mountain Home until I was basically through with that and went to breakfast, it would have been roughly two hours, maybe a little bit more.
- Q. All right. And you went to breakfast at the El Rancho in Mountain Home approximately 9:00 a.m. of that day; is that correct?
 - A. No, sir.
 - Q. What time was it?
- A. This would have been sometime around 8:00 a.m. or -- shortly after Deputy Maxwell and Mr. Woodall arrived at

1		WESLIE WOODALL,
2	a witness p	roduced on behalf of the State, having been first
3	duly sworn,	took the stand and testified as follows:
4		
5		DIRECT EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. REMAI	KLUS:
7	Q.	Would you state your name, please.
8	.	Weslie Woodall.
9	Q.	And where do you live, Mr. Woodall?
10	3.	Post Falls, Idaho.
11	Q	And what is your occupation?
12	a.	I'm an investigator for the State of Idaho
13	Department	of Law Enforcement.
14	Q.	And how long have you been so employed?
15	A.	Two years and four months.
16	Q.	And how long have you been living over at Post Falls?
17	J.	Four months.
18	Q.	And where did you live before that?
19		In Weiser, Idaho for two years.
20	Q.	That's down towards Southern Idaho; is it not?
21	h.	Yes, sir.
22	Ĝ.	And have you had police experience, prior police
23	experience,	Mr. Woodall?
24	3.	Yes, sir.
25	Q.	And would you describe that.

1	O And how many years now have you been engaged in
2	law enforcement?
3	A. Thirteen.
4	Q. Pardon?
5	A. Thirteen.
6	Q I'm having difficulty hearing you, I'm sorry,
7	Mr. Woodall.
8	Now, directing your attention to the 5th day of
9	November, 1974, were you employed in your present position?
10	A, Yes, I was.
11	Q. And did you happen to be in the vicinity of Cascade,
12	Idaho?
13	3. I was sent there, yes.
14	Q. And how did you happen to go to Cascade, Idaho on
15	that day?
16	A. The Chief of our Bureau called me on the telephone,
17	told me to report to Sheriff Lynskey at Cascade, Idaho to assist
18	in the homicide investigation.
19	Q. And where were you when you received this word?
20	A. Weiser, Idaho.
21	Q. And about how far is that from Cascade?
22	A. One hundred twenty miles.
23	Q. And did you respond to this directive and go to
24	Cascade?
25	A. Yes, sir.

1	blankets and observed the bodies of two male men.
2	Q Did you
3	A. People that were
4	Q Officer Woodall, did you take photographs that night?
5	A. Yes, I did.
6	Q. Handing you what's been admitted into evidence as
7	Plaintiff's Exhibit 1-A, did you take that photograph?
8	A. Yes, I did.
9	Q. And which photograph is actually taken there at that
10	spot, the small one or large one?
11	A. The small one was taken. This was an enlargement I
12	had made later.
13	Q. And directing your attention to evidentiary item
14	1-B, did you take that photograph also?
15	A. Yes, sir.
16	Q. And how about 1-C?
17	A. Yes, I took 1-C also.
18	Q. And did you take the photograph that's been
19	admitted into evidence as State's 1-G?
20	A. Yes, sir.
21	Q. And did you also take the photograph admitted into
22	evidence as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1-J?
23	A. Yes, sir.
24	Q. Mr. Woodall, what did you do as after you arrived
25	at the scene and after you inspected the bodies with other law

1 enforcement personnel? 2 A. We gathered different items which we believed to be 3 evidence of what happened, or indicating possibilities of what 4 happened, put it in plastic bags, marked the bags and assisted in 5 making a drawing, measurements using a steel tape to pinpoint the 6 location of these bodies and assist in, at sometime later, 7 loading the bodies in a hearse for transportation. 8 Now, Mr. Woodall, handing you what's been admitted 9 into evidence as State's Exhibit 3-A, would you look at the 10 Exhibit, please. Do you recognize the Exhibit? 11 12 A. Yes. And would you tell us what it is, please. 13 0. This is a freehand drawing that was made on the night 14 A. 15 of November 5, one mile south of Donnelly by Deputy Sheriff James Maxwell. 16 And there are measurements appearing thereon? 17 0. Yes, there is. Zi. 18 Did you help in making those measurements? 19 0. 20 f_{\cdot} Yes. And did you assist and advise in the preparation of 21 (). 22 that --23 -Yes. -- Exhibit? 24 0 25 3. Yes.

1	Q.	Now, Mr. Woodall, have you had an opportunity to
2	observe Stat	te's Exhibit 3-A here on the board?
3	Α.	Yes, I have.
4	Q.	And have you compared it with State's Exhibit 3,
5	the smaller	sketch?
6	A.	Yes, sir.
7	Q.	And you believe this to be a fairly accurate
8	representat:	ion of the same scene?
9	A.	Yes, I do.
10	Q.	Thank you. About how long or would you tell us
11	what the wea	ther was that night one mile south of Donnelly?
12	A.	Quite cold, somewhat overcast. It got very cold
13	before we le	eft.
14	Q.	And you remember about what time it was you left
15	there?	
16	A.	Oh, before midnight, after 11:00.
17	Q.	And did you say that you helped load the bodies into
18	the undertal	ker's station wagon?
19	Α.	I was there and assisted, yes.
20	Q.	Um-hmm. And that and the undertaker is also the
21	Coroner of .	up there; is he not?
22	ž).	Yes, sir.
23	Ω.	Do you know who that is?
24	4.	Mr. Walker.
25	Q.	Yes. He testified here

1	A. Yes.
2	0 recently?
3	You were here when he testified; is that correct?
4	7. Yes.
5	About how many hours were you there at the crime
6	scene that night?
7	A. Approximately three.
8	Q What I want to ask you about, Mr. Woodall, was
9	other items of evidence that you may have helped to gather there
10	Do you recall what they were at the crime scene?
11	A. Do you want me to relate each one?
12	Q. Yes.
13	A. There was pieces of plastic, they were white. There
14	was, oh, small pieces of glass
15	MR. REMAKLUS: It's going to take me a moment to locate.
16	(Brief delay.)
17	Q. BY MR. REMAKLUS: Handing you what's been admitted
18	into evidence as State's Exhibit 7, Mr. Woodall, would you
19	describe the Exhibit?
20	A. A small pieces of plastic that were in the wide
21	graveled area to the west of the highway.
22	Q. And did you pick those up that night?
23	A. Yes, sir.
24	Q. Would you look at the how do you know that you
25	picked those up?

1	some people trying to determine what had happened, or if anyone
2	had seen anything happen.
3	Q. And then, after that, what did you do, Mr. Woodall?
4	A. Next days was spent interviewing and talking to
5	people from McCall, Donnelly, New Meadows.
6	Q. Did you have occasion to view the automobile
7	portrayed in State's Exhibit 28-A and 28-G?
8	A. Yes, I did.
9	Q. And when was the first time you saw that car?
10	A. During the early morning hours of the 9th, I believe.
11	Q. And where was that?
12	A. In the Phillips 66 service station at Cascade.
13	Q. And did you make an inspection of the vehicle at
14	that time?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. Then what was the next thing you did, if anything,
17	with reference to the investigation of this case?
18	A. Traveled an area south of Cascade below Cougar
19	Mountain Lodge where Deputy Maxwell and I recovered some papers
20	from over the riverbank down in the rocks.
21	And do you know about where that was?
22	It was at a turnout close to mile post 94, I believe
23	O Is that on the North Fork of the Payette River
24	there in the canyon?
25	A. Yes.

1 holidays, every Sunday and I'm going to skip, they've got 2 New Year's Day, Washington's birthday, Decoration Day, 3 Independence Day, first Monday of September, Labor Day, and we 4 come to the second Monday in October; which is Columbus Day. 5 So, every Sunday and Columbus Day; which is the one 6 we're faced with now is what is referred in the Statute as a 7 "Nonjudicial day during which no court can be opened nor any 8 judicial business transacted." 9 So, I guess we'll have to obey the law. So, we'll 10 be in recess until next Tuesday at 9:30. 11 If you will abide by the amonition during this recess 12 and cooperate with the Bailiffs in carrying out their oaths to 13 have you abide by this admonition please. 14 (Recess taken.) 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Jim Maxwell and to me and, as well as a transcript of a typed

interview made by Miss Spaulding to Mr. Thomas and me at

24

Women's State Prison in Nevada.

In addition thereto, we are having prepared a transcript of Miss Spaulding's testimony upon a plea of guilty to the charge upon which she is now imprisoned. As soon as we have received that we shall immediately present Counsel and the Court with a copy of that. This is the area in which we will inquire of Miss Spaulding.

THE COURT: If I understand correctly, these transcripts of statements you've taken from her that you furnished to Mr. Boyd, covered the entire area you intend to go into here as a witness?

MR. REMAKLUS: Yes. We would not attempt to go beyond that.

THE COURT: On the other hand, do you intend to go into all the matters covered by those statements?

MR. REMAKLUS: Probably not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Does Mr. Boyd know which ones you do not intend to go into?

MR. REMAKLUS: Well, we don't have the transcript of the plea of guilty proceeding and we have not yet gone down, line by line with Mr. Boyd. We will have to do that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Boyd, do you feel at this point that this information you've received -- well, let me ask you first, do you concur that you have received these items that Mr. Remaklus represents have been furnished to you?

MR. BOYD: Yes, Your Honor. I've been furnished a copy of a transcript of an interview in Carson City, Nevada on June 17, 1975 and an interview in Boise on April 8, 1975.

It will be our position, Your Honor, that Miss Spaulding is entitled to the privilege against self-incrimination as to all the matters set forth -- that is, if those transcripts are an indication of where the Prosecution is going and where the Defense would be going on cross-examinati we will take the position that it's privileged.

THE COURT: Before I ask you to make any showing in that regard, let me just ask you, do you feel you are sufficiently advised of the area the State intends to cover with her as a witness to make a showing at this time in support of your claim of privilege?

MR. BOYD: Yes, assuming that -- that is the attorneys for the State have assured me that the testimony will be no more broad from their viewpoint than is contained in these transcripts and I feel sufficiently advised to make a showing if that's the scope of the examination.

THE COURT: Yes. Very well.

Well, frankly, I intend to limit them to the scope they revealed to you so that will solve that.

I understand that it is the burden of the witness claiming the privilege to make a showing and does present son of a problem for that witness, as I understand, because in the

1

2

3

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 93705

25

R.

citations of authority or not. I'm aware of the fact that the Court has had this question in mind and has done some briefing on the matter.

We'll be relying on -- well, we've also considered, Your Honor, the fact that Carol Spaulding has pled guilty to a violation of 18-205, Idaho Code; the Accessory Statute, I take this position.

Even with that in mind, for the reason that I'm concerned about that Idaho case, State against Hall, 86, Idaho, 63; that has to do with double jeopardy and I am mindful of the more recent United States Supreme Court case, Turner against Arkansas, 92 Supreme Court, 2096. We can't take the chance that our Idaho Supreme Court is not still the controlling law so I think, essentially, that's our position, Your Honor.

position is, Mr. Boyd, in all respects; on this last point you make, I understand your point on these other crimes, but on this last point I assume what you are actually referring to is in view of the fact that the crime she actually pleaded guilty to was an accessory after the fact and not as a principal and involved a fact occurring after the alleged crime on trial here. She may be still prosecuted as a principal for the main crime on trial?

MR. BOYD: Yes, Your Honor, that there is that danger.

Now, I've confined our showing just to the facts between Lewiston and Glenns Ferry, Idaho. Now, I see it's my understanding that the Court is entitled to take into consideration in the showing various facts and I see, by recent newspaper articles, that Mr. Robinson is somehow, if the newspaper quotes him correctly, intends to show various facts all across the United States.

But, I don't think the Court wants to hear my argument on that at the present time.

THE COURT: I take it -- I don't particularly care to hear argument, but I would like to know what your position is going to be if -- so we can get all this laid out right now.

Assuming this situation develops that the State calls Miss Spaulding and limits their scope of direct examination very narrowly so that Mr. Robinson would not be permitted to cross-examine to get into other areas and Mr. Robinson has, then, selected to call Miss Spaulding as his own witness for the defense and endeavors then to get into some of these other areas you just alluded to, what would be your position at that point?

MR. BOYD: Our position will be that she will claim the privilege against self-incrimination in that Mr. Robinson, if I understand correctly from what I read in the newspaper, is contending crimes were committed in other states that could, perhaps, involve Miss Spaulding.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

MR. ROBINSON: In view of those comments, Your Honor, I'd like to place this on the record: That Mr. Boyd did contact me by phone Sunday evening after his appointment and I told him that I would make my entire files available to him for his appraisal regarding his court appointment chores and task and tentatively make an appointment for 8:00 a.m. yesterday morning.

During the entire day my phone was constantly monitored; whether I was there or not and there was never a recontact. So, Mr. Boyd has not made himself available for information from my files and they are still available if he cares to inspect them.

I do intend to call Carol Spaulding in the defense's case regardless of what restriction the Court places upon the defense in cross-examination; limited to that scope covered in direct examination, Your Honor.

THE COURT: State care to respond to Mr. Boyd's showing?

MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, we would take this position and
it is based on the case that we have recently found entitled

In Re: Master Key litigation. I don't have the citation but I
will provide it to the Court and Counsel at a later point.

THE COURT: What's the name?

MR. THOMAS: In Re: Master Key litigation. It's a

Federal case and strikes me that it was sought by the Eighth

Circuit Court of Appeals. In any event, it's our impression that

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705

the material covered in these interviews that Mr. Boyd has referred to and in Miss Spaulding's sworn testimony at the time of the plea of guilty is exculpatory as far as she is concerned with respect to this particular crime.

It's our intention to limit the direct examination of Miss Spaulding to those matters relating to the murders of two men near Donnelly, two crimes that Mr. Creech is charged with and circumstances of the arrest of the defendant and Miss Spaulding near Glenns Ferry and facts related to those two incidents.

Master Key litigation case suggests that, as far as a witness is concerned, witnesses not open to unlimited cross examination after having testified to facts of this kind.

Under those circumstances we don't see that there's any threats of self-incrimination if Miss Spaulding were to testify to facts which she's already testified to once under oath and which she has given in these two interviews that have been referred to.

Under those circumstances it does not appear to us that she's in any danger of incriminating herself because the defendant is not entitled to go beyond those facts on cross examination into anything that might be incriminating. I might just say for the record that we don't have any evidence of any other incriminating material that is solid, or credible, and we have no plan and know of no plan to prosecute Miss Spaulding for

1 any other crime.

THE COURT: Let me ask you, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Boyd has asserted that the privilege extends not only to directly incriminating testimony but any facts that might link her in a chain of evidence to prove crimes.

Now, if she is placed right at the scene of these alleged homicides, in the immediate scene and present personally at the scene of that homicide; isn't that a very strong link that would incriminate her, at least in a chain of evidence if she were later prosecuted as a principal in that?

MR. THOMAS: That would tend to be so were it not for the fact that in her statement she has contended that the killings were a surprise to her; that she didn't know they were coming.

THE COURT: As I alluded to, Mr. Boyd, the problem we have in this kind of a determination, though we can't -- you know what the testimony previously was, but we can't foretell what her testimony in this trial is going to be and that's what we're concerned about, her being incriminated on, is her testimony given in this trial, not being incriminated on the statements you have there.

She can't be compelled to reveal what that testimony is because that, per se, would incriminate her if the testimony were going to be of that nature. So, we have to sort of work in the dark about what her anticipated testimony is and decide it, basically, on arguments here.

While I recognize these statements would serve to impeach her if she changes that testimony, she isn't, really, precluded from changing it and the incrimination we're talking about is the incrimination that would come from her future testimony, not incrimination from these statements.

MR. THOMAS: Well, that is correct, Your Honor, we do not yet have the transcript of her testimony under oath at the -- statements which she made under oath at the time of her guilty plea and I'm assuming they are consistent. We'll know specifically when we receive that information.

But, I would simply take the position again that I think having once given testimony under oath is -- may lay out these facts, she has either waived the privilege by doing that, consistent with the holding in the Master Key case; or else she doesn't have any concern for immunity because she stated under oath that she doesn't have any -- she was not involved in this crime. Her direct examination would be limited to those facts.

THE COURT: I understand there is, perhaps, some conflict.

Doesn't the great weight of authority say that testimony under

oath in a prior proceeding is not a waiver?

MR. THOMAS: There is a great deal of authority. I haven't had that opportunity, frankly, to research it extensively enough to know what the majority view was and the minority view on the point.

THE COURT: All right. I'll let you reply, Mr. Boyd, if

you wish to make a reply.

MR. BOYD: I think anything further, Your Honor, as to the contention of the State that there was some type of a waiver of her privilege because of former testimony, I'm simply not prepared to say anything because I haven't had a chance to see a transcript of that yet. So, I would just be spouting ignorance as to testimony at a prior proceeding. It had been my understanding of the law that we're concerned about testimony at the proceeding and that testimony at a prior proceeding is not a waiver.

But, I wouldn't represent to the Court that I have recently researched that.

THE COURT: This one point that Counsel are reserving here on the prior testimony at her guilty proceeding on the accessory charge as constituting a waiver of the claim of self-incrimination, and I feel that is an important and material point because, of course, if she's waived then she has no right to claim it at this proceeding.

But, apart from that issue of whether there has been a waiver, I'm inclined to feel that she is in danger of incriminating herself and I would sustain her claim of privilege; unless the State is prepared to grant her immunity.

MR. THOMAS: Well, in that event, Your Honor, and still reserving the waiver question, assuming the Court decides against us on the waiver point, we would move that the Court

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

order Miss Spaulding to testify as to these matters under a grant of immunity.

MR. BOYD: Then, Your Honor, may I inquire if the State would be proceeding under 1114 or 1115?

THE COURT: I was just checking those Statutes, Mr. Boyd. As I understand, 1114 would involve an agreement between the State and the witness. I'm not -- I don't think the State would be in controlling position there unless Miss Spaulding were willing to enter into an agreement with them for immunity. If she isn't willing to agree with them and enter into a written agreement for immunity, then they would have to move, under 1115; which would require the Court's intervention. I can't answer that question.

MR. BOYD: I can represent that the State certainly is not agreed with me on behalf of my client to any immunity in any way, shape or form. So, I'm assuming they are talking about 1115.

MR. THOMAS: That's correct, Your Honor,

THE COURT: Well, since you've just been brought into this, Mr. Boyd, by appointment, I want to accommodate your schedule. I'd like to get the waiver question finally resolved before we proceed with the formality of immunity if that's to be granted.

MR. BOYD: Can we get it solved when I see that transcript, sir?

THE COURT: When do you expect to have the transcript in your hands, Mr. Thomas?

MR. THOMAS: We were unable to talk to the Reporter this morning when we called, Your Honor, because he was in court.

The message was left that we did need it urgently and we would expect to have it today or tomorrow; follow up on that. But, I can't give a definite answer at this point.

THE COURT: Would you know what time tomorrow?

MR. THOMAS: I don't because I don't know just what schedule we would have to follow in getting it up here. We would have to have it hand-carried by someone; whether that would involve flying it up or driving it up, I'm not sure.

MR. BOYD: I can be prepared as far as the briefing goes, today.

THE COURT: Would you need -- I take it you wouldn't need this transcript for your briefing.

MR. BOYD: No, sir.

THE COURT: If your briefing might resolve -- you need it to support your position.

MR. BOYD: Yes.

THE COURT: Would you be available, under your schedule, Mr. Boyd, perhaps to come in this evening after our evening recess at some time between 4:30 and 5:00 to take this matter up; or will that give you enough time?

MR. BOYD: No, I'll be available.

3

4

5

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right, we'll take this matter of law as far as waiver, then, following our evening recess today.

So Counsel will be fully advised, if it is determined, as a matter of law, that there, of course, has been a waiver that will conclude the matter. If it's been determined that there has not been a waiver then, as I understand the Statute, the State would be required to make the request for immunity in writing and, then, the Court would have to rule on that immunity.

I frankly see no reason at this point not to grant it if the State makes a proper request in writing under the Statute. If it's granted, I would order Miss Spaulding then to testify, if Counsel can be prepared for both alternatives.

MR. BOYD: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So, I think the end result is that in either case I think it appears likely that Miss Spaulding will be ordered to testify based on the representations of the State because, if the Court determines, as a matter of law, there has been a waiver, then she wouldn't be permitted to claim the privilege and would have to testify in that circumstance. If the Court determines there has not been a waiver she would be entitled to claim the privilege because, as I understand the State is prepared to offer her immunity under the Statute and I see no reason not to grant that if the State properly requests it.

1 MR. BOYD: I understand that. 2 MR. REMAKLUS: Yes, Thank you, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: All right, as far as this matter, then, it will be continued until after our evening recess to take up 4 5 the waiver matter. Counsel prepared to proceed before the jury at this 6 7 time? MR. REMAKLUS: Yes, Your Honor. 8 MR. ROBINSON: Yes, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Bring in the jury. 10 (Jury entered the courtroom.) 11 THE COURT: Let the record show the jurors are all 12 13 present. Proceed with Mr. Woodall, then. 14 MR. REMAKLUS: Yes, thank you. 15 16 WESLIE WOODALL, 17 produced as a witness on behalf of the State, having been 18 previously duly sworn, took the stand and testified further 19 as follows: 20 21 22 23 24 25

IN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 1940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705

1	DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)
2	BY MR. REMAKLUS:
3	Q Mr. Woodall, before the evening recess last Saturday
4	I think I asked you if you had had occasion in connection with
5	this matter to go to Glenns Ferry or to Mountain Home, Idaho.
6	Did you have occasion to do that?
7	A. Yes. I went to Mountain Home, Idaho.
8	Q. And on what day?
9	A. November the 8th, 1974.
10	Q. And were you with anyone else when you went down
11	there?
12	A. Deputy Sheriff Jim Maxwell.
13	Q. And where is he from?
14	A Valley County, Cascade.
15	Q. And how did you travel with him?
16	A In Deputy Sheriff Maxwell's County patrol vehicle.
17	Q. Do you remember what time you and Deputy Maxwell
18	arrived in Mountain Home?
19	A. At about 8:30 a.m.
20	Q. And upon your arrival in Mountain Home what did you
21	first do?
22	A. We stopped at the El Rancho. We learned, by radio,
23	that the investigating officers, Detective Freeman and
24	Patrolman Hill and were at the El Rancho for breakfast. We
25	stopped there and had coffee with them and conferred about the

1	MR. REMAK	LUS: Yes, this is correct, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT	: Maybe keep the record clear if we could
3	refer to both th	e trial exhibit and the "Q" numbers.
4	MR. REMAK	LUS: Apparently this tag has fallen off the
5	Exhibit, Your Ho	nor. What's the number on the tag, Mr. Woodall?
6	THE WITNE	SS: Number 47.
7	Q. BY M	R. REMAKLUS: This is the Exhibit you referred to
8	just a moment ag	o? Would you reaffix it in some manner to the
9	bag.	
10	A. (Wit	ness complied.)
11	Q. Mr.	Woodall, would you remove the rest of the
12	contents of the	bag. Would you describe what you are holding?
13	A. It's	a shirt, has Q-28, some initials inside.
14	Q. And	have you observed that shirt before?
15	A. Yes.	
16	Q. Where	e was that?
17	A. In the	he Elmore County Courthouse, Commissioners' Room
18	on November the	8th, 1974.
19	Q. And	also remove the remaining contents of the bag.
20	A. Pair	of dark gray trousers.
21	Q Is th	nere a "Q" number on the trousers, Mr. Woodall?
22	A I do	n't yes, Q-25 and some initials.
23	Q And I	have you seen the Exhibit before?
24	A. Yes.	
25	Q. And s	where was that?

1	A,	In the Elmore County Courthouse, Commissioners' Room,
2	November	the 8th, 1974.
3	Q.	Is there anything else in the bag, Mr. Woodall?
4	A.	Yes. Two white, or gray socks, one marked Q-32
5	and the c	other marked Q-33.
6	Q.	And do you know whether do you recognize them?
7	A.	They appear to be the same as what was on the table
8	in the El	more County Courthouse on November 8, 1974.
9	Q.	Thank you.
10	A.	Two shoes marked Q-27 and Q-26.
11	ο.	Have you seen them before?
12	А.	Yes.
13	Q	And where was that?
14	7.	In the Elmore County Courthouse on November 8, 1974.
15	Ģ.	Are there any more contents to the bag, Mr. Woodall?
16	in the state of th	There's a belt marked Q-29.
17	Ć.	And have you seen the belt before?
18	P.	Yes.
19	Q	And when and where was that?
20	Ä.	In the Elmore County Courthouse, the Commissioners'
21	Room on N	ovember 8, 1974.
22	Q.	Do you recognize that as being the belt
23	Ä.	Yes.
24	Q.	Thank you. Would you let's put the items back in
25	the bag m	arked State's Exhibit 47 so we keep them straight.

one that her and Tom had gotten a ride in at Lewiston and had ridden in. She referred to a place where "Tom shot those guys and put the bodies in the ditch."

She then stated she had got in the car and proceeded on towards Boise; that the car had run out of gas; that they had slept for awhile in the car; that after the car had run out of gas they tried to push it into the river. They couldn't push it and, then, they hitchhiked on to Boise; that they were in Boise a couple days and that --

MR. REMAKLUS: Just a moment, please.

- Q BY MR. REMAKLUS: Can you tell us whether or not Miss Spaulding related the manner in which they departed from Boise?
- A. She stated a guy that they had stayed with gave them a ride in a vehicle out to the rest area, just out of Boise.
 - Q Go ahead, please, Mr. Woodall.
- A. And, then, they were picked up and given a ride to Glenns Ferry and they were arrested there.
- Q. Do you recall whether or not Miss Spaulding related any details of the arrest?
 - A. I don't recall.
- Q. Do you recall whether or not Miss Spaulding related any details concerning any of the evidentiary objects that you have just testified to?

1	down. At that time he asked for a cigarette and he was given	
2	one.	
3	Q. Mr. Woodall, handing you what's been marked for	
4	identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 55, could you identify	
5	that for us, please.	
6	A. This is a form that Deputy Sheriff or	
7	Detective Freeman had gave to me earlier and it says	
8	"Notification of Rights" on the top of it.	
9	Q. And is that the form that he gave to you there at	
10	Mountain Home that day?	
11	A. Yes, it is.	
12	Q. What, if anything, did you do with that?	
13	A. I took it with me into the office when I interviewed	
14	Tom Creech.	
15	Q. Did you read it to him?	
16	A. Yes, I did.	
17	Q And what, if anything, did he do with reference to	
18	the form?	
19	A. He initialed each question in the center of the	
20	page. Where it says "Waiver" there is six statements with a	
21	blank behind each statement and the initials "T.E.C." were	
22	put there by Tom Creech.	
23	Q And did he sign that Waiver?	
24	A. Yes, he did.	
25	O. And was that signed in your presence at the time	

1	we're talking about?		
2	A. Yes, sir.		
3	0. And were there witnesses to that?		
4	a Yes.		
5	0 And who are the witnesses?		
6	a. Myself and Martin J. Maxwell.		
7	And you witnessed the defendant's signature on the		
8	Waiver?		
9	A. Yes.		
10	Q. And did Mr. Maxwell witness it in your presence?		
11	A. Yes, he did.		
12	MR. REMAKLUS: I would offer Plaintiff's Exhibit 55,		
13	Your Honor.		
14	MR. ROBINSON: No objection to 55, Your Honor.		
15	THE COURT: Let me look at it just a minute, Mr. Remaklus.		
16	MR. REMAKLUS: Yes, Your Honor.		
17	MR. ROBINSON: My understanding, Your Honor, 55 is just		
18	the first sheet?		
19	MR. REMAKLUS: That is correct.		
20	THE COURT: Just for the record, was since it is		
21	stapled to some more pages what are the other pages? Are they		
22	56?		
23	MR. REMAKLUS: Yes.		
24	MR. ROBINSON: Yes, they are stapled. Right at the bottom		
25	of the second page, Your Honor, 56.		

7

8

9

11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right, 55, just being the top sheet of several sheets, will be admitted, then.

MR. REMAKLUS: Thank you.

(State's Exhibit No. 55 admitted into evidence.)

MR. REMAKLUS: May I read this into evidence at this
time, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. REMAKLUS: "Notification of Rights". I am reading from State's Exhibit 55.

"Before we ask you any questions, you must understand that you have certain rights under both the Idaho and United States Constitutions. You do not have to talk to us. You have the absolute right to remain silent. Anything you say can and will be used against you in Court. You have the right to talk to a lawyer for advice before we ask you any questions and to have the advice and presence of a lawyer even if you cannot afford to hire one. You have the right to request the services of the Public Defender at any time if you cannot afford to hire a lawyer, and such Public Defender will be assigned to represent you at public expense. If you want a lawyer present or if you wish to consult a lawyer, you have the absolute right to remain silent until he is present or has been consulted, whether he be the Public Defender or a lawyer of your own choosing. If you wish to answer guestions now without a lawyer present, you have the right to stop answering

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

That basic objection is as to the voluntariness of the statement because of the then condition of Thomas Creech. I further interpose objection from the line "I was in the service" to the balance of this statement, the latter part of Page 5, all of Page 6 and all of Page 7 with the unnumbered attachment, basically for the reasons stated to the Court on the 3rd day of October in the Suppression Hearing and ruled by the Court at that time; the same were not admissible.

If I may, Your Honor --

Motion to Suppress, I'm going to overrule the objection as to voluntariness. I'll sustain the objection to the portion which you speak to of deleted, beginning there with Page 5 at the point indicated. I would also offer at this time to sustain an objection and delete a portion of Page 4, again on the same basis that I deleted the part requested on Page 5, about the last 13 lines, if you want to look at that,

Mr. Robinson.

MR. REMAKLUS: The last how many lines?

THE COURT: Approximately 13, beginning with the words "a couple".

MR. REMAKLUS: Yes.

MR. ROBINSON: Upon consideration of what the Court has stated, Your Honor, yes, at this point we would interpose the same objection as to the last three pages for that area on

1 Page 4 that the Court has pointed out. 2 I would assume, Your Honor, that would also include 3 the first four lines on Page 5? 4 THE COURT: Yes, but I would leave in, following those 5 first four lines until we get down to the point you've 6 previously referred to. 7 MR. ROBINSON: I'm sorry, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: I would overrule the objection as to the 9 remaining portion of Page 5 after the first four lines down to 10 the point that you have already referred to. 11 MR. ROBINSON: Yes, Your Honor, I intended that that 12 would stay in. 13 THE COURT: Yes, that would stay in. 14 All right, subject to those deletions I will 15 admit the Exhibit. 16 (State's Exhibit No. 56 admitted into evidence.) 17 MR. REMAKLUS: Your Honor, I would like to read the 18 Exhibit into evidence but I'm fearful that I haven't followed 19 all of the Court's instructions and I don't want to read stricken 20 portions. 21 THE COURT: All right, I'll bracket, if it's all right 22 with Counsel, I'll bracket in red pen the portions deleted and 23 then let Mr. Robinson look at it to see that he concurs before 24 you read it.

MR. ROBINSON: Very fine, Your Honor.

25

MR. REMAKLUS: I'd appreciate it.

THE COURT: For the record, I would add that the Court has just added the red brackets in red pen that appear on the Exhibit and I have also written the word "End", E-n-d, on the point at Page 5 that the State is supposed to stop.

Show that to Mr. Robinson.

MR. REMAKLUS: Yes.

THE COURT: Does that conform to your understanding?

MR. ROBINSON: That conformed.

THE COURT: You may read.

MR. REMAKLUS: I would ask to present a photocopy so, if I start to read something that I shouldn't, if the Court would stop me, please.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. REMAKLUS: I have one more question to ask the witness, Your Honor.

- Q. BY MR. REMAKLUS: Mr. Woodall, directing your attention to the printed matter at the top of the first page, was that read aloud to the defendant before the statement was taken?
 - A. Yes, it was.

MR. REMAKLUS: Thank you.

This is entitled "Voluntary Statement".

"Date, November 8, 1974; Place, Mountain Home Police Department, Mountain Home, Idaho; Time Started, 2:00

21

22

23

24

25

1 blank ii.

"I, the undersigned, Thomas Eugene Creech, am 24 years of age, having been born on September 9, 1950 at Dayton, Ohio. I now live at" blank.

"I have been duly warned and advised by
Weslie Woodall, a person who has identified himself as an
Investigator and Police Officer that I do not have to make any
statement at all, nor answer any questions or do anything that
might tend to go against me or incriminate me in any manner,
and that any statement I make, can and will be used against me
on the trial or trials for the offense or offenses concerning
which the following statement is herein made.

"I was also warned and advised of my right to
the advice and presence of a lawyer of my own choice before or
at any time during my questioning or statement I make, and if I
am not able to hire a lawyer I may request and have a lawyer
appointed for me, by the proper authority, without cost or
charge to me.

"I do not want to talk to a lawyer, and I hereby knowingly and purposely waive my right to the advice and presence of a lawyer before and during any questioning or at any time before or while I voluntarily make the following statement to the aforesaid person, knowing that anything I say can and will be used against me in a court or courts of law.

"I declare that the following voluntary statement is

made to the aforesaid person of my own free will without promise of hope or reward, without fear or threat of physical harm, without coercion, favor or offer of favor, without leniency or offer of leniency, by any person or persons whomsoever."

The initial "Q." The initials "WW: Tom we are investigating a double murder that took place about five days ago in Valley County in Idaho.

"Tom: I did it, I did it, I did it."

Then the word "crying" in parentheses -THE COURT: In quotes.

MR. REMAKLUS: Thank you.

"Q" and the initials "JM: When" and then there is a space with a line written through it with the initials "TEC" written in there.

The next printed portion, "I killed those two guys. I need help." Then another line, initals "TEC".

Resuming, now:

"We went to" and a word is crossed out and the initials "TEC" appear above it. So, it reads, "We went to Lewiston from Spokane got a ride with two guys Wayne and Tom. I shot him three times only shot Tom once. Carol didn't know I was going to do it. We stopped to go to bathroom. Wayne tried to rape Carol. He put his hands on her tits. We stopped and Carol got out I" -- and then a slash and the initials "TEC".

"We stopped by" something and the initials "TEC" --

"side of the road and there was a ditch.

2

3

"Question WW: What time and day was this. Sunday about 1 o'clock. That is 1:00 in the morning. That would be

4

1:00 a.m. Monday morning."

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"I have read each page of this statement consisting of seven pages, each page of which bears my signature, and corrections, if any, bear my initials, and I certify that the facts contained herein are true and correct. I further certify that I made no request for the advice or presence of a lawyer before or during any part of this statement, nor at any time before it was finished did I request that this statement be stopped. I also declare that I was not told or prompted what to say in this statement.

"This statement was completed at 4:00 p.m. on the 8th day of November, 1974, Tom E. Creech, Page 1 of 7" written with the initials "TEC" written under that.

Witness signature, "Weslie L. Woodall, witness" a signature "William S. Hill".

On Page 2 the printed matter is crossed out, two lines, and initials "TEC" written across and written in there "Page 2 of 7" and then the number "2".

"Right after they picked us up they sold a battery charger for some gas. We took Highway 95 when we left Lewiston. It was dark at Grangeville. In Whitebird we stopped in a bar and sold a coat for some beer. Tom said a big fat

1 lady. It was Budweiser beer. Cans. We stopped later and I got 2 some cigarettes at a service station. Kools. That is where 3 Wayne played with Carol's tits. Wayne was riding in back 4 seat by himself. Wayne said he was in prison nine years in 5 Alabama. I think he said for shooting a colored guy. 6 was wearing Levis. Tom wore Levis. And light shirt. Tom 7 said he would like to fuck Caro. I was mad but don't remember 8 what was said. I had some beer. Carol don't drink. Then 9 they stopped at that place. While Carol was pissing Tom said 10 something about her twat. I just fucking went crazy. I shot -- " 11 the name "Wayne" appears and crossed out and "Tom" printed 12 above it with the initials "TEC" -- "first. I shot him -- " and 13 some crossed out places and initials "TEC" -- "one time" --14 "TEC" -- "Wayne had a knife and came -- " At the end of this 15 page it says "I have read each page of this statement consisting 16 of seven pages, each page of which bears my signature, and corrections." 17 18 This is the same material that appears at the bottom 19 of the first page that I have read. 20 The signature line "Thomas E. Creech" appears, 21 "Page 2 of 7" witnesses "Weslie L. Woodall, William S. Hill." 22 THE COURT: Why don't you start with that sentence again. 23 MR. REMAKLUS: Thank you, Your Honor. I might add, on 24 the top of Page 3 of 7 the printed matter is stricken out, line 25 through it and the initials "TEC".

Now, for continuity:

"I shot him one time. Wayne had a knife and came at me I hit him with the end of the gun. He fell back and I shot him three times" which has been interlineated with the initials "TEC". "He fell against the door. I got out of the car. Tom was throwing blood all over the place. I stood there for a minute or two. Then I drug them out of the car over to the ditch and covered them with a blanket and sleeping bag.

"I took their billfolds and kept them in the car.

We drove a little ways and stopped by a cafe and motel and Carol
got out and threw up. Carol wanted to call police. We stayed
awhile then drove on down the road till the car ran out of gas.

I threw the billfolds in the river then we started hitchhiking.

"About 20 minutes past and a guy and girl in a blue and white Mazda picked us up and took us to Boise. It was morning time and daylight.

"A guy named Jim Marsh picked us up and took us to his house and his wife was pregnant and had a baby the next morning."

There's printed material that I have read to you at the bottom of the page with the statement that this same was completed at 4:00 p.m. on the 8th day of November, 1974. It is endorsed on there and in pen "Page 3 of 7" the signature of "Thomas E. Creech" appears on the line saying "Signature of person giving voluntary statement" and the witness,

2

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

"Weslie L. Woodall, William S. Hill."

Now, says "Page 4 of 7" at the top, the printed material has a line through it and the initials "TEC".

Number "4. We stayed at Jim's trailer house until last night. We went to the hospital a couple times and visited his wife. I told him what I had done. Jim had a Mercury Comet wagon white with black on the sides red seats. We went target shooting with him. He took his gun I took mine the Hi Standard automatic. Jim bought the boxes of shells in Carol's purse last night before we left. Jim's gun is a .22 revolver. The safety quard on the cylinder was missing that keeps the shells from falling out."

Proceeding on Page 5 of 7 with the printed material being marked out and initials "TEC".

"We shot all the shells up that was in the gun.

"I stole the gun from the guy that is living with Carol's mother in Lewiston. That was on Sunday.

"Last night Jim brought Carol and I to the rest area. About 1:00 or 1:30 Steven Paul Rivers gave us a ride to Mountain Home. I went to sleep. We then went to Glenns Ferry where we got arrested."

Is that the end of the statement that I'm permitted to read?

THE COURT: You can read the printed matter and the signature again.

1	been marked	for identification as State's Exhibit 59, would you
2	look at it,	please.
3		Is that a photocopy of the Miranda Warning given to
4	Mr. Creech	in Mountain Home on that day?
5	A.	Yes.
6	Q.	Were you present when that was read aloud?
7	Α.	Yes, sir.
8	Q.	Is that the defendant's signature at the bottom of
9	the page?	
10	Α.	Yes, it is.
11	Q.	So, is that your signature on the appearing as
12	a witness th	nere too?
13	A.	Yes, sir.
14	Ω.	And who is the other who are the other witnesses
15	were you	present when they signed it?
16	Α,	Yes, sir.
17	Q.	Who were they?
18	Α,	C. C. Campbell; which was the Magistrate, and a
19	"Wilson" and	l I'm sure he's a Mountain Home Police Officer, I
20	believe.	
21	Q.	Um-hmm. And you signed it also?
22	А,	Yes.
23	Q.	And do you know this to be a photocopy of that
24	statement?	
25	A.	Yes.

of Elmore. State of Idaho, plaintiff, versus Thomas Creech, defendant, Case No." blank.

"Acknowledgement of Notification. This is to acknowledge that C. C. Campbell, who has identified himself to me as a duly appointed, qualified and acting Magistrate of the District Court in and for Elmore County, Idaho, has advised me of the following facts:

- "1. That I have an absolute right to remain silent and do not have to make any statement.
- "2. That in the event I did decide to make a statement, anything I say can and will be used against me in a court of law.
- "3. That I have an absolute right to have a lawyer advise and represent me at all stages of the proceeding.
- "4. That I have the right to a lawyer even if I cannot afford one, and if I cannot afford one, I may use the services of the Public Defender at any time and at public expense.
- "5. That I have the right to have a preliminary examination.
- "I understand the above and have a full awareness of each of said rights as explained to me by the above-named Magistrate.

"Dated this 8th day of November, 1974, at 5:45 p.m." Signature line "Tom E. Creech, defendant."

1 believe if we would have the corresponding "Q" number with each 2 of those, we would have no objection. THE COURT: Ten, 11, 12 and 13 will be admitted. MR. REMAKLUS: The "Q" number of 10 is Q-4, the "Q" 5 number on State's Exhibit 11 is Q-1, the "Q" number on 12 is Q-2, the "Q" number on 13 is Q-3. 7 May the Clerk mark the outside of the envelope with the exhibit number as well as the bottle being marked? THE COURT: Well, if she can mark the bottle without 10 covering up anything. 11 THE CLERK: I'm going to mark the envelope with the 12 exhibit number, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Yes. 14 (Whereupon State's Exhibits 10, 11, 12 and 13, 15 previously marked exhibits, admitted into evidence.) 16 MR. REMAKLUS: At this time I would offer State's 17 Exhibit 22 and State's Exhibit 23. 18 MR. ROBINSON: No objection, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Twenty-two and 23 will be admitted. 20 MR. ROBINSON: For description purposes, Your Honor, 21 22, also designated K-1. 22 MR. REMAKLUS: Yes, on the FBI report that we're going to 23 introduce in a minute, it would be K-1. 24 (Whereupon State's Exhibits 22 and 23, previously 25 marked exhibits, were admitted into evidence.)

1 (Whereupon State's Exhibit No. 25-A, a previously 2 marked exhibit, was admitted into evidence.) 3 MR. REMAKLUS: Offer State's 26. 4 MR. ROBINSON: No objection. 5 THE COURT: Twenty-six will be admitted. 6 (Whereupon State's Exhibit No. 26, a previously 7 marked exhibit, was admitted into evidence.) 8 MR. REMAKLUS: Probably take me a minute to check my 9 notes, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: All right. 11 MR. REMAKLUS: I would offer State's Exhibit 41, ten 12 rounds of ammunition. 13 MR. ROBINSON: No objection, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Forty-one will be admitted. 15 (Whereupon State's Exhibit No. 41, a previously 16 marked exhibit, admitted into evidence.) 17 MR. REMAKLUS: I'd offer State's 42, 43, 44 and 45. 18 MR. ROBINSON: Those have been previously offered and 19 rejected by the Court. 20 THE COURT: Sustained because that doesn't apply for the +-21 MR. REMAKLUS: That's where we were. 22 We'd offer 46, a shell casing. 23 MR. ROBINSON: The same as Q-5, Your Honor, and I have 24 no objection. 25 THE COURT: Forty-six will be admitted.

1N W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 3940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705 2,125 WOODALL, W., Plf., Di. COLLOQUY.

1	A. Something to that effect.
2	Q. And that Creech would talk?
3	A. Something like that. He stated he had talked to
4	him and he would talk; other than at that time he called him
5	"Turner".
6	Q. At that time he was still calling Tom Creech
7	Tom Turner?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. All right. And the first person you chose to see
10	was Carol Spaulding?
11	A. Yes. She was at the Courthouse when we went back
12	there.
13	Q. All right. You have to go past the Police Department
14	to go on a block further, block and a half further to the
15	Sheriff's office in Mountain Home; is that correct?
16	A. That's correct.
17	Q So, actually, it was your choice to talk to
18	Carol Spaulding first; is that correct?
19	A. Not necessarily.
20	Q. Why was she chosen to talk to first?
21	A. We went to the "Ada" County Courthouse to look and
22	Q. You are referring to the Elmore County Courthouse?
23	A. Elmore County Courthouse, to look at the articles
24	that had been taken from Creech and Spaulding and see if they
25	were to be considered as evidence.
- 11	

1	2 All right. Before going up to look at those, did		
2	you look into Carol Spaulding?		
3	I looked in the door through the jail cell.		
4	0. She was in a cell?		
5	. Yes.		
6	Describe her demeanor to the jury.		
7	A. Had stringy blonde hair, dressed in blue jail		
8	coveralls, was nasty talking, loud, angry acting.		
9	Q. How long at this particular point did you observe		
10	her?		
11	B. Just momentarily.		
12	All right. Then did you go ahead and proceed up		
13	to the Commissioners' Room on the second floor to investigate		
14	and check out this property?		
15	A. Yes.		
16	Q. And how long did you engage yourself in that		
17	activity before you commenced a question and answer period with		
18	Carol Spaulding?		
19	A. Probably a half hour.		
20	Q. Would you give us the time of your best estimate as		
21	to when you commenced the interrogation, or questioning of		
22	Carol Spaulding?		
23	A. More somewhere close to 10:00 a.m.		
24	Q. And again who was present with you during that		
25	question period, or session?		
\$			

1	carnival.
2	Q. In California?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q She describe the fact to you that she had traveled
5	to and from Kentucky with Tom Creech?
6	A. Not that I recall.
7	Q Did she leave you at that point with an impression
8	that she had just met Tom in California and come to Lewiston,
9	Idaho?
10	A. No.
11	Q. What impression, or what did she say in that regard
12	as to the travels?
13	A. A question was asked how long she had been with
14	Tom. She said, as I recall, it was a couple of months.
15	Q All right. She had been traveling with him,
16	all right.
17	Now, would you go ahead and continue to describe
18	further what this interview session was like following what
19	you've already stated?
20	A. She kept asking for a cigarette. When she was
21	refused she'd get mad and be sullen, hang her head, refuse to
22	answer. Then she would start talking again.
23	Q During this time did she ever ask for any pot or a
24	"hit"?
25	A. No.

1		Q.	Ever ask for any medical aid or assistance?
2		A.	No. She was asked several times if she had taken
3	drugs,	if s	he was on drugs.
4		Q.	And what was her response?
5		A.	She said "No".
6		Q.	All right. Now, during this session you had knowledge
7	that To	ow wo	uld talk to you?
8		A.	I had an indication that he would.
9		Q.	All right. What method or mode of police work did
10	you use	e in 1	breaking down Carol to get a statement from her about
11	Arnold	and I	Bradford?
12		MR.	REMAKLUS: I would object to "breaking down", the use
13	of		
14		THE (COURT: Yes, the objection is sustained.
15		Q.	BY MR. ROBINSON: Officer Woodall, would you
16	describ	e to	us what method of questioning that you used prior to
17	Carol (comin	g forth with information about the death of Arnold
18	and Bra	adfor	1?
19		A_*	I don't know if I understand how to answer that
20	questio	on.	
21			There was no certain method or anything used. It
22	was mei	cely a	a question and answer and
23		Q.	And she suddenly, during one of these questions,
24	just bl	lurte	d out "Tom did it"; is that the way it happened?
25		A.	She never at any time denied that he did it. She
11			

1	reduced to	a handwritten, or a document in writing or typed?
2	A.	I didn't do it. I think Officer Hill included in
3	his report	part of what she said. I don't know for sure.
4	Q.	Do you recall whether or not during this hour session
5	on the 8th	of November, 1974, whether or not the pictures of
6	Arnold and	Bradford were exhibited to Carol Spaulding?
7	A.	There was a Polaroid photo shown to her, yes or
8	several Pol	aroid photos.
9	Q.	Several Polaroids?
10	A,	By Officer Maxwell, had some Polaroid pictures he
11	had taken.	They were shown to her.
12	Q.	Hadn't you also taken some film?
13	A.	Yes, sir.
14	Q.	Weren't those available?
15	A.	No, they were not developed yet.
16	Ω.	What was Carol's reaction when she looked upon these
17	photographs	of Arnold and Bradford?
18	А.	She hung her head and covered her eyes. She cried
19	some.	
20	Q.	And she did what?
21	A.	I don't recall her words right at that time.
22	Q.	And was this the identical reaction she had to both
23	pictures?	
24	Ā.	Of both pictures of both bodies or what?
25	Q.	Yes.

1	I think she was shown both at the same time.
2	Q. Did she identify the bodies of the persons in the
3	photographs?
4	A. Not that I recall; other than her statement.
5	THE COURT: We'll take our noon recess at this time.
6	We'll be in recess until 1:30. If you remember the
7	admonition, don't discuss the case and keep your minds open.
8	(Noon recess taken.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	WALLACE, IDAHO, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1975, 1:30 P.M.
2	(Jurors re-entered the courtroom.)
3	
4	THE COURT: Let the record show the jurors are all
5	present.
6	MR. ROBINSON: May I continue, Your Honor?
7	THE COURT: Yes.
8	
9	CROSS EXAMINATION (Continued)
10	BY MR. ROBINSON:
11	Q Officer Woodall, in your direct examination I
12	listened carefully to your qualifications and you've served many
13	of the Idaho communities, not only as a police officer but also
14	Chief of Police; is that correct?
15	A. Two communities as Chief of Police, one as a
16	City Police Officer.
17	Q. All right. And you are presently an Investigation
18	Officer with the State of Idaho, the Attorney General's Office?
19	A. No, it has no connection with the Attorney General's
20	Office.
21	This is, what, special group, then?
22	Department of Law Enforcement.
23	All right. And this is on a statewide basis?
24	% Yes.
25	And in your career as a law enforcement officer, you

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

- What were the questions? Were they similar to what 0. attorneys ask here in court and then what happened in order to prompt her to further explain?
 - Yes.
- And these were after pausing in the telling of this 0. story?
 - A. Yes.
- All right. Officer Woodall, would you specifically relate to us your entire recollection, as of this time, as to what she said occurred up there at Donnelly when Arnold and Bradford were killed, as you remember it.
- In response to where had she been and where had they came from they had been in Lewiston visiting her mother. She was asked where the gun came from, she said from the man that Tom had stole it from; the man that lived with her mother.

She stated they had came toward Boise from Lewiston; that at Lewiston they had -- they were hitchhiking, they got a ride with two men in a car. I don't recall if she named them by name or not; that they had stopped and the men were drinking, that they had stopped to get beer and get gas; that they had stopped at one point and the one in the back seat had put his hands on her breasts, I think while Tom went in to get cigarettes. She told Tom about it. They went on down the road, they had stopped at this place and, I don't recall how she identified the place, but the place where the shooting took

place. She had got out to go to the bathroom when Tom --- she said then "Tom shot those quys".

She said she had run from the car, Tom got out and hollered at her and told her to come back or he would shoot her too. She came back, she said "I didn't want to get in the car, Tom put the bodies in a ditch and covered them up."

She said they then got in the car, went on down the road towards Boise. At one point they stopped and they slept awhile -- well, back, her statement was in the car, when they stopped she said that the one in the back seat had a knife and held it at Tom's throat. Then, after they had stopped they had got out and then she said "And Tom shot those guys". That's when she run.

She said Tom told her to come back and then they got in the car, they went down the road farther, they slept awhile then they went on down the road until the car run out of gas and they had tried to push the car into the river but they couldn't push it. So, they got out and started hitchhiking about daylight. They were picked up and taken to Boise.

Q All right. Now, let's go back to that one point that you also had to go back to. Let's be very specific about your recollection and that's regarding the knife being held to Tom's throat before they stopped, I believe is the way you just testified.

Is that the way you remember those circumstances in

1	Q. To which he immediately responded by saying "I did
2	it, I did it, I did it."
3	A. That's correct.
4	Q. And he was crying?
5	A Yes not crying.
6	Q. Pardon?
7	A. In a crying tone of voice.
8	Q. All right. Officer Woodall, would you describe
9	totally, then, Tom's demeanor, appearance, the physical aspects
10	of his person right at that time?
11	A. His hair was quite messed up, sticking out quite a
12	bit. His eyes were slightly bloodshot, his hands were trembling,
13	he was shaken a little bit, he looked unkempt.
14	Q Did you apprise yourself of the amount of sleep
15	that he had had in the past 24 hours before commencing that
16	statement?
17	A. I don't know what he had been doing that day.
18	Q. Did you ask him any questions about the intake of
19	any medication, either by prescription or controlled substances?
20	Not that I recall.
21	Q When he was crying, were there tears in his eyes?
22	A Tears came to his eyes, yes.
23	Right at this point in the statement?
24	L. Yes.
25	O And then I believe that you described, the

diagonal line with the initials "TEC" appearing on that line and that immediately follows this outburst and the statement of "I did it, I did it." In quotes crying close quotes.

Then, the question "When". That is where this line commences that is initialed; is that correct?

- A. Yes.
- Q. All right. Now, when you went back with Tom did you specifically ask Tom to give you again the information of when?
- A. This was a question by Jim Maxwell and I don't recall what -- the "When" entailed. I don't recall if he finished that question or he started to say something, Tom said something else before he finished.
- Q All right. But, hadn't the question been stated, or statement made to Tom at that time, "This is your statement, you want to add or change anything before you sign it."

Isn't that correct, when you went back to draw these lines?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And it's your testimony at that point Tom didn't want to change that or add anything to it so a line was just drawn and his initials taken?
- A. This was a question that Jim Maxwell had asked at the time we went back and Tom initialed these blank spaces. Jim was not there, so this -- the first blank indicates the question --

24

25

1	0 A lot of which people?
2	Other people who had some knowledge, or came forth
3	with what they thought was knowledge or information about this.
4	Q All right.
5	1. It was either
6	0 Who were they specifically, if you recall?
7	A. Kenny Records in Nampa.
8	Q Out of Nampa?
9	N Yes.
10	Q. And who is he?
11	3. A truck driver, trucker.
12	And did he volunteer some information about seeing
13	hitchhikers on the road?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q All right. Who else?
16	A. The names I can't recall.
17	Q All right. How about the service station operator
18	at New Meadows that saw five people in this Buick?
19	MR. REMAKLUS: Object, assuming facts not in evidence,
20	Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Sustained.
22	Q BY MR. ROBINSON: Officer Woodall, did your
23	investigation continue to attempt to make sure you had the
24	right parties involved in this double death?
25	A. Yes, sir.
	Table 1

information that there were more than four parties in the 1956 Buick at any one time?

MR. REMAKLUS: I'm going to object to that on the same ground, Your Honor, this is suggestive. It's another way to do the same thing, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, leading questions are permitted on cross-examination. This doesn't assume any facts. It just asks if it's true or not. Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Not in the 1956 Buick in question. We talked to people in New Meadows, Idaho that had gave information about people in another type of vehicle, three men and a woman, or four men and a woman; which later proved to be a different type of vehicle. Physical descriptions were different and, which later we had reason to believe were hunters, deer hunters, and they had returned to Boise. That's the only indication of more people at any one time. The only information we had about anybody else.

Q. BY MR. ROBINSON: All right. And that's -- that information supposedly occurred on the same day that the '56 Buick would have been coming through New Meadows at approximately the same time?

- A. As near as I can recall after the information given to us when we went and talked to these people.
 - Q. That's the people at New Meadows?
 - A. Yes.

Boise, Idaho 83705

BY MR. REMAKLUS:

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

Mr. Woodall, when referring to the voluntary statement on Page 1 near the top of the page where it says, "Tom: I did it, I did it, I did it." You have the word "crying" then you have question "JM: When".

Now, if I understand correctly in response to Mr. Robinson's questions you said then after the statement was completed you went back and drew the hash marks down through there and Mr. Creech initial it, is that right?

- That's correct.
- Now, had the time of the shootings been established prior to the time you went back and made these corrections and initialed?
 - A. Yes.
 - So that was already in the statement; wasn't it?
 - Yes, it was. A.
- At the present time, during your investigation of this incident, did you ever have reason to believe that it was committed by anyone else?
 - A. No, sir.
- Directing your attention to the -- that portion of this statement on Page 2 where the defendant told you that he shot Tom first, did the defendant ever tell you which one of the two decedents was driving the car?

1	A. Yes.
2	O. And which one was that?
3	7. Tom.
4	O Did the defendant, during this time, ever tell you
5	where he was riding or Carol was riding in this '56 Buick?
6	h Yes.
7	Q. Where were they riding?
8	A. He stated that Tom was on the passenger side by the
9	door, Carol was in the middle in front, Tom was driving, Wayne
10	was in the back seat.
11	Q. Now "Tom was driving", who do you mean?
12	A. Tom Arnold.
13	Q. Now, during the course of taking this statement,
14	did the defendant ever tell you where he was at the time he shot
15	Tom Arnold?
16	A. On the passenger side of the vehicle.
17	Q. At the moment of the shooting?
18	A. Yes, in the front seat.
19	Q. Now, where was Miss Spaulding?
20	A. Outside of the vehicle
21	MR. ROBINSON: Objection
22	MR. REMAKLUS: Excuse me, did
23	MR. ROBINSON: I was going to state repetitious,
24	Your Honor, but apparently they have a mental wave going here
25	of a different time. I withdraw any objection and see where it

1	goes.
2	Q BY MR. REMAKLUS: What did you say, Mr. Woodall?
3	A. She was outside of the vehicle.
4	MR. REMAKLUS: Thank you. I have no further questions.
5	MR. ROBINSON: I have no further question of this
6	witness at this time, Your Honor. However, I do desire him held
7	to the subpoena and to appear in the defense's case.
8	THE COURT: All right. You'll have to be available for
9	further testimony if you are wanted, Mr. Woodall.
10	MR. REMAKLUS: Like to call Mr. Schreiber, please.
11	
12	WILLIAM SCHREIBER,
13	a witness produced on behalf of the State, having been first
14	duly sworn, took the stand and testified as follows:
15	
16	DIRECT EXAMINATION
17	BY MR. REMAKLUS:
18	Q. State your name, please.
19	A. William Schreiber, S-c-h-r-e-i-b-e-r.
20	Q. And what is your age, Mr. Schreiber?
21	A. Sixty-eight.
22	Q. Where do you live, sir?
23	A. Lewiston, Idaho.
24	Q. And what is your address in Lewiston?
25	A. 2404, Eighth Avenue.

1	0 How long have you lived in Lewiston, Mr. Schreiber?
2	Fifty-seven years.
3	0 How long have you lived at this particular address?
4	7 Fifteen years.
5	n Pardon?
6	. Fifteen years.
7	Q. Fifteen?
8	a. Yes.
9	Thank you. And anyone else reside at that address?
10	Ä. Yes.
11	0 Who is that?
12	. Mrs. Spaulding, I rent the house to Mrs. Spaulding,
13	two of her children.
14	Q. And do you retain space in it for yourself?
15	A. Oh, yes.
16	Q. Directing your attention to the third day of
17	November, 1974, were you living in that house?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. And can you tell me who was there at the house and,
20	say, the day before who had been present at there at that
21	house on the day before November 3rd, 1974?
22	A. You mean everybody that had been there, you mean?
23	Q. Yes.
24	A. Well, I don't know for sure. Now, Tom and Carol
25	came up to visit every day.

1	was just Kathy was there.
2	Q. And what's Kathy's last name?
3	A. Spaulding.
4	Q. All right. Is that a sister to Carol?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Directing your attention to the third day of
7	November, did you see the defendant on that day?
8	A. They were up at the house, yeah.
9	Q And you say "they". Who do you mean?
10	A. Carol and Tom.
11	Q. Were you there at the house all the time that they
12	were there?
13	A. No, I wasn't. I went downtown, I don't remember
14	whether I went to the grocery store or where, but I was gone for
15	awhile.
16	Q. And when you got back to the house was Miss Spaulding
17	and Mr. Creech, were they there?
18	A. No, no, they had left.
19	Q. I'm handing you what's been admitted into evidence
20	as State's Exhibit 22. Would you inspect that and tell us what
21	that is?
22	A. Yeah, yeah, that's a High Standard.
23	Q. Do you know who it belongs to?
24	A. Oh, yes, that was my gun. I had that gun for 30
25	years.

1	Q To your knowledge have they ever been back there
2	since that day?
3	A. No, never been back.
4	MR. REMAKLUS: You may examine, Mr. Robinson.
5	
6	CROSS EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. ROBINSON:
8	Q. Mr. Schreiber, you identified the people, or persons
9	who were visiting in this four or five days prior to the third
10	day of November, 1974 in your direct examination; is that
11	correct? You identified the persons that were visiting there?
12	A. Oh, yes, um-hmm.
13	And Mrs. Spaulding lived there?
14	. Yes.
15	Did Kathy live there?
16	n Yes.
17	Did Glen live there?
18	. No.
19	Q Who's Glen?
20	A. That's her son.
21	0 Glen Spaulding?
22	h. Yes.
23	Q. What's his age?
24	7. He's 11 now.
25	O Okay. And do you know where he's living?

1	A. He's living there at home now.
2	Q. He wasn't living there at that time?
3	A. No, he wasn't living there at that time.
4	Q. Where was he living?
5	A. In a foster home.
6	Q. Oh, all right. And who else besides Carol Spaulding
7	and Tom Creech visited there in the Spaulding home in that four
8	or five days prior to November 3rd?
9	A. Oh, boy, let's see. I'll tell you, I don't know
10	actually.
11	Q. Dan?
12	A. Dan yeah, there was a Dan there.
13	Q Dan what?
14	A. I don't know these people that these girls bring in,
15	you know, that boyfriends bring in, you know, at 68 years, I
16	haven't much interest in these kids, younger kids that they
17	bring in.
18	Q All right.
19	A. But, there was a fellow named Dan there and he's
20	with the Mormon Church now as a missionary or something.
21	0. That's what you've been told?
22	A. Yes, his mother.
23	Q Would you describe Dan? How tall is he?
24	D. Oh, I'd say about five-nine, ten; something like that.
25	0. And how tall are you?

1	3. I'm six foot.
2	Q All right. And Dan have a facial complexion problem?
3	Yes.
4	O. Acne condition?
5	i. Yes, very strong.
6	n About how much does Dan weigh?
7	One hundred between 155 and 165; somewhere right
8	in there. I don't know for sure.
9	0. How old is he?
10	Well, let's see. He's going right on 21 now, I
11	think.
12	Dan ever threaten you?
13	A. No.
14	0. Never has threatened you?
15	A. Threatened me? No.
16	O. Who else besides do you know where Dan lives?
17	E. Well, he lives in Clarkston, I think, but I don't
18	know. I understood he was in Salt Lake City or somewhere with
19	this missionary deal. I don't know. I don't know anything about
20	that.
21	Q. All right, That's
22	A. Just what I've heard other kids talk and I never
23	asked. Nobody told me that, I just kind of overheard it.
24	Q. Oh, all right.
25	A. I've heard them say that, that's all I know about it.
	*

I have no idea.

Q Now, in addition to that, in addition to Dan, what other names do you remember?

A. Boy, I don't remember any other names. I don't know them, that's truthful. I do not know, these girls come in with a boy and set around there a few minutes and take off and I just don't know who they are. I have no idea. I'm not interested enough to -- not ask, you know, it's none of my business.

Q. All right. Mr. Schreiber, if you would, tax your memory, not necessarily as to name, but number of other people during the four or five days while Carol Spaulding and Tom Creech were there, that came to visit.

- A. Girls and boys, both?
- Q. Yes.
- A. Oh, gosh, 12 probably.
- Q All right.

A. I'm not sure, some of them might have been the same ones again. Some there every day because they came to see Carol, you know, they have known Carol and went to school with Carol and some of them come over to see Carol and so forth. It might have been the same ones, but there was somebody there.

- Q And that's the first visit Carol had been there on since early in August; is that correct?
 - A Yeah, just about in August, yeah, um-hmm.

1	remember the admonition, ladies and gentlemen, don't discuss the
2	case and keep your minds open.
3	(Recess taken.)
4	THE COURT: Show the jurors are all present.
5	Call your next witness.
6	MR. THOMAS: E. C. Palmer.
7	
8	E. C. PALMER,
9	a witness produced on behalf of the State, having been first duly
10	sworn, took the stand and testified as follows:
11	
12	DIRECT EXAMINATION
13	BY MR. THOMAS:
14	Q. Would you state your name, please, and address,
15	please.
16	A. Eldon C. Palmer.
17	0. Where do you reside?
18	h. Boise, Idaho.
19	0 What is your occupation?
20	M. I'm Sheriff of Ada County.
21	And how long have you been in that position?
22	A. Three years.
23	O Sheriff Palmer, would you tell the jury a little
24	bit about your law enforcement background.
25	A. I've been in law enforcement for about 18 years. I

1

offered.

_

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We will excuse you, ladies and gentlemen, while we take this matter up. The Bailiff will advise you when we're ready to proceed with you.

If you will remember the admonition, don't discuss the case and keep your minds open during this absence.

(Jury left the courtroom.)

THE COURT: I would request that out of the presence of the jury you lay a foundation as to voluntariness before, and limit it to that. I'm not interested in you going to any extraneous matter other than the voluntariness of any statements you intend to offer.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. THOMAS:

- Q Let me ask you to tell the Court, Sheriff Palmer, what did you tell the defendant by way of giving him the Miranda Warning?
- A. Generally speaking, I told him -- advised him of his rights under the Idaho Code, United States Constitution, that you don't have to speak to me, anything you say may and will be used against you now or at a later time in the Court. You have the right to an attorney, if you do not have money enough to hire one, one will be appointed to represent you. You can stop questioning or stop answering any time that you desire.

from the original?

A. Yes, it is.

MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, the edited copy conforms with the material that we discussed in the court the other day when we went over Exhibit A to the Plaintiff's Pretrial Brief with the following exception.

We have included, at the beginning of this tape recording, the material which begins on Page 47 referring to Mr. Creech's rights to an attorney and starts with Sheriff Palmer saying, "Hey, Tom, I had told your attorney that I would not talk to you -- " and so on down.

Perhaps the best procedure would be to play the tape at this time.

THE COURT: I don't need to hear the statement, I'm just concerned about its voluntariness at this time; unless this is part of your foundation of the voluntariness.

MR. THOMAS: The material on the tape at the beginning portion, at least, is part of the foundation for voluntariness because it indicates the Defendant's responses. It shows the clarity of his response, shows the manner in which the information was communicated to him and seems to us to be relevant for that purpose.

THE COURT: I don't think that's really going to be the issue on this particular statement. I think the issue is going to be the fact that he had an attorney appointed at that time.

I think the Court record reflects that and I think the issue is going to be how well he was advised of his rights and, particularly, the right to have his attorney present at the questioning.

I don't think the clarity of it or that has anything to do with that. I think it's the substance of what was said is the issue.

Q. BY MR. THOMAS: Sheriff Palmer, did you, subsequent to the time of the receiving of or making this tape recording, receive a communication to -- from Mr. Creech relating to statements that he had given you prior to the date of the letter?

A. Yes.

THE COURT: Just a minute. I didn't want to put you off completely on that. I'm wondering if -- only thing I was going to suggest, I don't think I have to listen to the tape. If you've got a transcript of it, I can read what was said and I'm willing to do that; to avoid having to play the tape; unless Mr. Robinson wants to hear it, to hear the tone of the voices and that.

MR. ROBINSON: I will want to hear it, Your Honor, but I also want an opportunity to interrogate and cross-examine the Sheriff, basically on the foundation.

THE COURT: But I'm interested in the substance of what was said myself.

MR. THOMAS: Yes. Well, the material that I referred to,

"Let's go back to these Idaho cases"?

2

3

THE COURT: No, at the top where he says -- ten lines down from the top starting there.

4

5

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, Your Honor, I do have an objection as to its being voluntary and made at a time when he had counsel appointed.

6

7

THE COURT: You don't understand what I'm talking about, Mr. Robinson.

8

MR. ROBINSON: More than likely, Your Honor.

10

THE COURT: I'm not talking about admitting the statement Mr. Creech made at that time. I'm talking about

11 12

in lieu of having the Sheriff sit here and play the tape to me,

13

or repeat what he said. My being able to read what

14

Sheriff Palmer said to Mr. Creech about his rights and what

15

Mr. Creech said to him about his rights.

16

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, I'm in agreement the Court can take that from the transcript.

17 18

THE COURT: That's all I want to know at this time.

19 20 All right, I'll take cognizance of what appears in the transcript regarding what the Sheriff said to Mr. Creech and

21

what Mr. Creech said to him about his rights and understanding

22

his rights and waiving those rights. Perhaps I could hand the Sheriff what we have marked as Exhibit 49 and let him review

23 24

those remarks and just tell me whether they are accurately

transcribed.

Those are the parts. I want to know if they're an accurate transcription of what he said and what you said.

THE WITNESS: Judge, they are accurate. At this time, however, to clarify this I might explain something else if the Court wishes.

THE COURT: Well, once we get this in I think they are going to have some more questions they want to ask. I just want to know as to the accuracy of this.

THE WITNESS: Yes, that is an accurate transcription of this.

THE COURT: Okay.

All right, I'll say 49 has already been admitted for limited purposes and I'll admit it for the further purpose of considering the voluntariness of these statements and reflecting what Sheriff Palmer said to Mr. Creech and what Mr. Creech responded as far as his rights are concerned. At this point, if you have any objection for that limited purpose, Mr. Robinson --

MR. ROBINSON: No objection for that limited purpose, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead, Mr. Thomas, with any further foundation.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Your Honor.

and statement by Sheriff Palmer on Page 47.

2

3

If there are any other statements referring to the rights that were explained to Mr. Creech in that taped interview,

4

I'd like to have them referred to.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

I might ask you, Sheriff Palmer, do you know of any other places where the rights were explained during this particular interview; other than Page 1 of this transcript and Page 47 we've referred to?

THE WITNESS: Judge, I'm not sure whether they are on this transcript or not, but there is another portion on here that brought me to the point to talk to him about this and I'd like to explain it to the Court if you so desire.

THE COURT: Very well.

THE WITNESS: Mr. Creech was not satisfied with his attorney at that time and he wanted to fire him; the court-appointed attorney and say "I want to talk to you about this thing" and I -- and this has prompted me to say, you know, I'll talk to you about it, Tom, but understand this, that you have this attorney.

THE COURT: Is that in the transcript there someplace? THE WITNESS: I don't recall whether it's in this transcript or not, but, sir, it is a fact.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. THOMAS: There is another reference at Page 53 of the transcript, Your Honor, by Sheriff Palmer of the defendant's

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705 2,199 PALMER, E., Plf., V.D. By Mr. Thomas.

man manager Livid State Children

1

Q How -- did you solicit this tape or this interview in any way?

A. Yes, in the beginning I asked him if he would like to talk to the other detective, Mr. Dykes, and if he had any objections to talking to him and he said not at all; that he would. In fact, he wanted to come down and talk to him about them -- about the investigation.

MR. THOMAS: I have no further questions, Your Honor.

MR. ROBINSON: May I inquire, sir?

THE COURT: You want these Exhibits?

MR. ROBINSON: No, I don't believe so, Your Honor.

I have copies.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROBINSON:

- 9. Sheriff Palmer, from the 9th day of November, 1974, up through and including the date of May 22nd, 1975, were you specifically aware that Tom Creech was represented by Ward Hower of Cascade, Idaho as court-appointed counsel?
 - A. Yes, I was.
- Q. During this period of time that I'm specifically relating to, the November '74 to May 22nd of '75, had you inquired of Tom on many occasions and had question and answer periods and interrogation of Tom on out-of-state involvements?
 - A Yes.

- Q. Look up, now, Sheriff Palmer, and I assumed you covered that territory on Page 55?
 - A. Yes, I have.
- Q All right. Now, is that generally the understanding that you had of Mr. Creech's attitude towards his representation at that time and his then court-appointed counsel, Ward Hower?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Did you have that in mind when you made such -- and have knowledge of that when you made such statements commencing on Page 47 of the large paragraph in the center of that page where you made comments regarding Tom's rights about talking without his attorney being present on the Idaho circumstances?
- A. Not all of this. I don't think that I was aware of the "brain clipping" and so forth prior to this statement at that time, or the attorney telling him that he had made a deal.

I do remember -- or I do remember of him telling me
he wanted to fire his attorney and he wanted to get a new
attorney and that he had written to the Court requesting the
same. But, I don't remember these exact things until that time
and that place and that interview.

Q. All right. And what you are just testifying to that you did know of that general circumstance of the request

and desire to change attorneys? There had been a breakdown between Mr. Creech and his attorney prior to the 28th day of April, 1975 when this tape interview commenced?

A. That's correct.

MR. ROBINSON: May I inquire, Your Honor, whether or not the Court was also reading the material on Page 55?

- Q. BY MR. ROBINSON: Sheriff Palmer, would you --THE COURT: Go ahead.
- Q BY MR. ROBINSON: Sheriff Palmer, are you, at this point in time, familiar with the balance of the information contained in the transcript of this interrogation on April the 28th, 1975 when it refers to other circumstances out of state; subject matter when Dykes --
- A. I was there during the entire interview. I don't remember the exact words and so forth in the transcript. I have read it, but I couldn't tell you exactly what's in it now. It's quite a lengthy transcript.
- Q All right. Recalling what you do of the interview and this transcript, are there many other circumstances related to in that transcript that were representations made by Tom Creech that were not true?
 - A. Yes.
- Q And have you, as a law enforcement officer, attempted to take those representations and corroborate, or verify them as to truth or falsity?

Yes, I have.

And is that the basis of your now saying that the many of the other circumstances related to in that transcript are false?

Yes.

Do you feel that this information contained on Page 47, 48 and 49 are any more reliable than the other information that you know to have been proven false?

MR. THOMAS: Objection, Your Honor. I don't think the reliability of this information from the standpoint of truth or falsity of other statements in the transcript affects the voluntariness of it.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. ROBINSON: Your Honor, just one other area of inquiry. Could the witness then have this Exhibit? THE COURT: Yeah, it's right here if you want it.

BY MR. ROBINSON: Turn to that page, Page 47, if would, Sheriff Palmer, and up the fourth line where you said, "So, do you want to talk about these?"

Were you referring there to the Idaho deaths of Arnold and Bradford?

MR. REMAKLUS: What page are you on, please.

MR. ROBINSON: Page 47, fourth line from the bottom.

MR. REMAKLUS: Thank you.

"Do you want to talk about these?" THE WITNESS:

special treatment or trips out of state?

A. No, I don't think so.

MR. ROBINSON: Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. THOMAS: No redirect, Your Honor.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY THE COURT:

Q. Sheriff, I'd like you to explain to me what you mean by the first sentence in -- starting with "Hey, Tom, I had told your attorney -- "

Could you tell me what you had told his attorney and what you meant by that?

A. Yes, sir, I can. I had talked with his attorney and his attorney did not want me to talk to him about the Idaho cases without him being present. I told Tom, "Hey, Tom," like it says here, "I told your attorney I would not talk to you without your rights and so forth about the Idaho cases." And that's exactly what I meant and when he told me that he wanted to fire his attorney, that he wanted to talk to me about this Idaho case and that he didn't want him there, I agreed to talk with him. I took it that he meant exactly what he said in that case.

Q Did you have any conversation with him about firing his attorney before this -- in this particular interview this

22

23

24

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, I do have an objection as to the entry of this testimony at this time, basically because the lack of foundation that it is voluntary and made without coercion or deprivation or promise or reward, basically surround circumstances that Mr. Creech found himself in at that time to make any voluntary statement.

THE COURT: You can step down.

All right, I'll hear argument Counsel have on this.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Your Honor.

If the Court please, the question here is whether or not Mr. Creech could be interviewed properly by Sheriff Palmer and others after he had an attorney appointed. The State submits this question goes only to the question of voluntariness; whether he made a voluntary statement.

The Miranda Ruling does not require any, per se, finding that once a defendant has an attorney appointed for him he is no longer able to waive the right to make statements to law enforcement investigators without having the attorney present. I would call the Court's attention to the case of Moor versus Wisconsin, found at 495 F.2d 35, a case decided last year.

In that case the defendant was taken into custody and arraigned on felony charges and an attorney was appointed for him and later, after an attorney had been appointed, a detective questioned the defendant having knowledge that the

defendant had an attorney appointed for him. The defendant's confession in this case was admitted against him. The Court said if an accused can voluntarily, knowingly and intelligently waive his rights to counsel before one has been appointed there seems no compelling reason to hold that he may not voluntarily, knowingly and intelligently waive his right to have counsel present at an interrogation after counsel has been appointed.

The same holding appears in Coughlin versus
United States, a decision of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
in 1964. I believe that appears at 391 F.2d 371. Certiorari
was denied by the Supreme Court of the United States at
393 U.S. 870 and 89 Supreme Court Reporter 159.

In that case the defendant gave an oral confession in an interview room at the jail at a time when he was represented by counsel when his attorney was not given notice of the interview. The police knew that he was represented by counsel. It was determined by the Court that he voluntarily gave such a statement and the Court of Appeals in this case held there's no, per se, rule to the effect that a waiver of counsel's presence could never be truly voluntary unless counsel was present to advise on it.

The question also is, is it voluntarily, knowingly and intelligently waived and not whether counsel was present.

The same effect is the case of State versus Richmond, appearing at 533 P.2d 553, decided by the Arizona Appellate

Court in 1975.

The case of State versus Vidal, 508 P.2d 158 cited by the Supreme Court of Washington in 1973 in which a defendant was being transported from Wallace, Idaho to Tacoma, Washington in an automobile after an attorney had been appointed to represent him in Idaho. During the automobile trip he gave a number of incriminating statements. The Court in that case found that the statements had been voluntarily given and it was not significant that an attorney was not present at the time that the statements were made during the automobile trip.

I would also call attention to the wording used.

Mr. Robinson has asked some questions about the meaning of the words, "I don't care" in response to the question "Do you want to talk about these", referring in the context to the murders of Bradford and Arnold.

There is no -- as the Arizona Appeals Court has said, there is no significant words required to prove a waiver of constitutional rights. That case appears at 533 P.2d 533. It was decided in 1975.

The Illinois Appellate Court at -- in People versus Carbona, C-a-r-b-o-n-a, at 327 N.W. Reporter 2d, Page 546 held that the test is -- the test of a knowing waiver is a showing of knowing intent; which is determined not only by the language employed, but also by a combination of that articulation, the surrounding facts and circumstances. It depends on the context

8

6

9 10

11 12

13

14

20

21

22

23

24 25

in which the language appears and when a person is asked "Do you want to talk about these crimes" and he says, "I don't care", that, obviously, in the context of the statement made, means yes and in the context of all of this the defendant has shown to have given a knowing and intelligent waiver.

Furthermore, this defendant had numerous, if you will, warnings repeated over and over again from the time of his arrest. He knew his rights and there isn't any question about that. It's been held in a number of cases that once a full and complete knowing waiver has been given it's not necessary to keep repeating the Miranda Warnings every time after that; whenever an interrogation is given.

I just would like to further refer the Court to a few of those cases. One of them is Commonwealth versus Klinger, decided by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in 1975. It appears at 337 Atlantic 2d 69; case of State versus Allen at 535 P.2d, Page 3, decided in Arizona in 1975; case of Moore versus Hopper at 389 Fed. Sup. 931, decided by District --Federal District Court in Georgia in 1974 and McGuire versus United States at 396 F.2d 327 decided in the Ninth Circuit in 1968; United States versus Otterburg, O-t-t-e-r-b-u-r-g, 423 F.2d 704 decided in the Ninth Circuit in 1970, certiorari denied by the Supreme Court of the United States; State versus Gilreath, G-i-1-r-e-a-t-h, 482nd P.2d 385 decided by the Arizona Supreme Court in 1975, certiorari was denied in that case.

7

8

9 10

12

13

11

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

The standard of proof of voluntariness in a hearing of this kind is that the voluntariness of the statement be proved only by a preponderance of the evidence. That rule was set out by the United States Supreme Court in Lego versus Twomey at 404 U.S. Reports 477, 92 Supreme Court Reporter 619. We think, Your Honor, that the State has made a sufficient showing of voluntariness of this statement; that it should be admitted.

It is obviously probative and relevant to the issues in this case. There is no doubt the defendant knew what he was doing, voluntarily gave this statement and it should not be excluded from evidence.

MR. ROBINSON: If it please the Court, our objection, Your Honor, I'm sure the Court can see just on the surface of it, is based upon the attorney-client relationship then in existence that had degenerated to the point of a total break-up with Tom Creech feeling the total futility of having any reliable legal advice from the attorney that had been appointed to represent him; that those conferences had been few and far between and duration short whenever the contact actually had been made, as it manifested itself some week or so prior to this particular statement.

It had degenerated to the point that the language used, approximately six pages after this where Mr. Creech had even there related to Mr. Palmer, his questioner, that his attorney had the attitude that Tom should be executed and even

making recommendations that if he's convicted of second degree that he would get him full life sentence -- hopeful for a full life sentence without possibility of parole at all and that his attorney was prejudiced against him.

That, coupled with Sheriff Palmer's testimony that many of the surrounding circumstances that are part of this transcript occurring at the same time were non-truths and maybe this only would go to the weight and not as to the admissibility of a later statement being made on the subject matter of the Idaho deaths. But, that at this time comments were made in expectation of special treatment, reward or benefit and not a total voluntary statement on the part of Mr. Creech.

From what I read there we are not in any new ground in addition to the voluntary statement of November 8, 1974 or new ground that wasn't stated by Carol Spaulding on that same date in November of '74; but rather this is being offered only that some six months later, five to six months later, that the same story is continuing and at this point the voluntariness of these comments being made in answer to questions, I don't believe has been carried by the State by the preponderance that they must show in the foundation of voluntariness; especially under the specific circumstances that we have in this unique case.

THE COURT: Well, I think the objection that -- as to the

accuracy of truthfulness of the statement, his -- actually that goes to the weight and not to the voluntariness or the admissibility of the statement. So, I would overrule that objection.

I think there's been no showing of coercion or threats or promises. If there were any question about that at all I think the letter written by Mr. Creech, apparently, simply on his own without encouraging or anything else, in June of '75 reaffirming that all these statements that he's given to Sheriff Palmer, Bud Mason and Dr. Heyrend and the psychologists were free and voluntary and without any threats or promise and of his own free will would negate any question at all, if there were any, about coercion or pressure or threats of any kind.

The sole point I'm concerned about is the point of whether he was fully and adequately advised of the right to have his attorney that was then representing him present during the questioning and whether he affirmatively and clearly waived that right.

Now, I think that's essential. I think that's essential under all the cases that Mr. Thomas cited. I think in those cases there was no question of a clear and affirmative clear-cut waiver and clear-cut advice of that right.

I don't find this case that clear-cut. I think it's equivocal. Number one, Sheriff Palmer says -- and this, of course, I appreciate wasn't an agreement with Mr. Creech, it was

an agreement with defense counsel himself. But, the agreement was that he would not talk to Mr. Creech about the Idaho cases and that the attorney did not want him to talk to him about the Idaho cases.

Now, I think to me this has a material bearing on the kind of advice that has to be given when you are going to get Mr. Creech to waive that right and I think it has -- it can't be left equivocal or ambiguous in any way.

Now, I appreciate there was a rather clear-cut explanation of the rights given at the beginning of this April 28th interview by the investigative detective from California, Mr. Dykes. However, that dealt with the incidents in California and not with the Idaho incidents.

When the switch-over came to talk about the Idaho incidents there was just a -- simply reference back to those rights. There was no representation of them, no emphasis of his right to have his Idaho attorney present and, then, I don't find this statement "I don't care" that equivocal and clear-cut a waiver that I think Miranda requires. I think that's ambiguous.

I would interpret that as meaning he'd do whatever the Sheriff wanted him to do, really. I'm going to sustain the objection that -- on the finding that he was not adequately advised of his rights then at that time when the Idaho cases were starting to be -- he was starting to be questioned about the

Idaho cases. He was not adequately advised of his rights and did not affirmatively waive those rights to counsel at that point.

I'm going to do this with it and I would say this about the authority on this: I accept, basically, Mr. Thomas' statement that the majority rule is that the fact that a defendant is represented by counsel at the time he's questioned does not, per se, render those questions inadmissible. I think there isn't any question that's the majority rule. I would also note, though, just in passing that there were substantial dissents in several of those cases and that there are cases that go the other way. There's at least one Circuit Court that's gone exactly the other way. New York has gone the other way.

Those cases held that you simply can't talk to him once he has his own his attorney without having that attorney present, or having that attorney consent to be -- not to be present. I don't particularly adopt that rule, that's not the basis of my ruling, I want Counsel to understand that. I would go with the majority rule if there was a clear-cut advice of his rights in this case at the time the Idaho cases were starting to be questioned. I mean, the questioning turned to the Idaho cases. If there was a clear-cut advice of his rights right at that point and a clear-cut waiver then I would accept the majority rule. But, I don't find that that existed.

I would advise Counsel, for their own advice and how

you want to handle this, I feel that under the very recent United States Supreme Court case of Oregon versus Hoss that this statement could be used for impeachment if the defendant takes the stand and gives contradicting testimony.

I'm not saying that by way of threats or compulsion,
I'm just advising Counsel of what I understand the law to be and
the state of the law and at that point that would be my ruling;
that this statement would be admissible for impeachment
purposes under that Oregon case. That went to the United States
Supreme Court, the Hoss case; which is either a 1975 case or
'74 case.

MR. THOMAS: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. THOMAS: I take it you overruled our --

THE COURT: I've sustained Mr. Robinson's objection at this point, yes.

MR. THOMAS: For the record the State would object to the exclusion of this proffered evidence on the ground that no timely motion to suppress was made and that right to have the evidence excluded was waived.

THE COURT: Well, as far as I understand, that would preclude Mr. Robinson from trying to put on contradictory evidence, or controverting evidence; which he hasn't even proffered here. I don't think the failure to make a motion to suppress waives the requirement that the foundation would show

7

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

it's voluntary and the adequate warning given. I don't think that foundation has been laid.

Are you ready to proceed to another subject with Sheriff Palmer, or with another witness or how?

MR. THOMAS: No, Sheriff Palmer's testimony is entirely based on this material. We would now wish to proceed to Mr. Mason's testimony which involves another confession made in the plane during the plane crash and perhaps the Court would prefer that we move on to that now out of the presence of the jury; to determine whether Mr. Mason can testify.

THE COURT: Yes, as long as we have the jury out we might as well take that up.

MR. ROBINSON: Your Honor --

MR. THOMAS: Call Mr. --

MR. ROBINSON: I'd like the record to show that Sheriff Palmer is, at this time, being dismissed by the State for further examination; that I have not had an opportunity of cross-examination that has occurred in the presence of the jury and further that I do desire to retain Sheriff Palmer under subpoena for presentation in the defense's case.

THE COURT: Very well.

Well, I think when we get the jury back in you can proceed with your cross-examination as to the matters that were covered, if you wish to.

MR. ROBINSON: Your Honor, perhaps I'm being presumptuous,

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705

25

2,225 COLLOQUY BETWEEN COURT AND COUNSEL.

had been up that early morning and removed the snow from it and

confused now about exactly where you are. You said you started out with him saying that this occurrence made a Christian out of him --

THE COURT: I know what it is, I've got it written down, you don't need to have him repeat it for me.

- Q. BY MR. THOMAS: What happened next? What happened after that?
- A. Well, about that time we had a radio turned on because we had broken radio contact and didn't know exactly where we were. The pilot had gone in one direction and Sheriff Palmer had gone in another direction seeking help leaving me there with Tom Creech and Tom Taylor.

About that time I heard an airliner give his altitude of about 30,000 feet, he was talking to Salt Lake City.

- Q What was Mr. Creech's behavior like during this time; during the time he gave you the statement he gave you described a few moments ago?
 - A. Well, like it is now.
- Q Did he seem in any way -- was there anything unusual about the manner in which he was speaking?
- A. No, it was -- he volunteered the statement, I listened.
- Q. With respect to the statements, do you know what events he was referring to when he said he had no reason to kill those guys?

1	A. I assumed he was talking about the Bradford-Arnold
2	murders in Donnelly.
3	Q. What makes you believe that?
4	A. I'm an Idaho officer and he was arrested for that
5	particular crime.
6	Q. He didn't use their names?
7	A. No.
8	MR. THOMAS: I have no further questions, Your Honor.
9	MR. ROBINSON: May I inquire, sir?
10	THE COURT: Yes.
11	
12	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
13	BY MR. ROBINSON:
14	Q. Mr. Mason, you and Sheriff Palmer,
15	Sergeant Tom Taylor of Ada County Sheriff's office,
16	Tom Creech and a pilot had been in Barstow, California; is
17	that correct? That's where you were returning from?
18	A. That's correct.
19	Q. And there you were looking into mines and honeycombs
20	of tunnels for several bodies; is that correct?
21	A. That's correct.
22	Q. And this occurrence that we're speaking of here
23	took place on the flight home?
24	A. That's correct.
25	Q. First of all, on that excursion out of state into

HN W. GAMBEE, C.S.R. 10940 Hollandale Drive Boise, Idaho 83705 2,232 MASON, A., Plf., V.D. By Mr. Robinson. Sheriff Palmer was flying it, and tried to climb around the thunderheads and went up to 14,000 feet and that's when Sergeant Taylor started turning blue on a shortage of breath up to there. Is that what occurred?

- A. I think we had been traveling at about 14,500 with Sheriff Palmer at the controls.
- Q. And then you climbed from that point or Sergeant Taylor just started turning blue?
- A. The Sergeant at this time already asked me for the oxygen and I handed him the oxygen.
- Q. All right. And the seating arrangement at that time was, the pilot in the pilot's seat, Sheriff Palmer in the co-pilot's seat, behind the pilot Sergeant Taylor, behind Sheriff Palmer, Tom Creech, and you were in the back jumper seat; is that correct?
 - A. No, that's not correct.
 - Q. All right. What was the seating arrangement?
- A. Pilot was in the pilot's seat, Sheriff Palmer was sitting beside the pilot, I was sitting directly behind the pilot, Tom Creech was sitting behind the Sheriff, Tom Taylor was sitting behind Tom Creech.
- Q All right. And this is where everyone was when Sergeant Taylor had a shortage of breath necessitating putting the plane down on the ground.
 - A Is that a question?

1	Q. So, Tom Creech, Tom Taylor. And who did he hand
2	the gun to?
3	A. Sheriff Palmer.
4	Q. Then the Sheriff was there in the plane also?
5	A. No, he was standing out on the one of the
6	landing gears outside the plane.
7	Q. Now, did the conversation that you related to here,
8	take place subsequent to that occurrence?
9	A. You mean subsequent, sir?
10	Q. After the gun was in Tom's possession and handed to
11	the Sheriff?
12	A. No, the conversation took place before.
13	Q The conversation you related to that Tom said
14	"This has made a Christian out of me, the jury should find me
15	guilty" took place before that gun incident?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. How long prior?
18	A. Possibly 30 minutes.
19	Q. Did Tom in that conversation to you express any
20	fear of being down on the ground in the State of Nevada?
21	A. Tom Creech?
22	Q. Yes.
23	A. Not in that Counselor, we set on the ground
24	there for about four and a half hours before we were rescued.
25	So, there was a lot of conversation during this four and a
- 11	

1	THE COURT: Any redirect?
2	MR. THOMAS: No, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: You can step down.
4	Anything further?
5	MR. THOMAS: Nothing further.
6	THE COURT: Any objection?
7	MR. ROBINSON: Yes, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: On what grounds?
9	MR. ROBINSON: The grounds would be that it's so evasive,
10	so vague in its meaning that probative value being tied
11	specifically to the deaths of Arnold and Bradford are a total
12	assumption and I don't believe that the foundation has been
13	laid, Your Honor, by the State for the admissibility of this
14	conversation to be given to this jury in this case.
15	THE COURT: Mr. Thomas?
16	MR. THOMAS: All of that goes to the weight and not to
17	the admissibility of the evidence.
18	THE COURT: I think the record in this case reflects
19	what I can take judicial notice of the jury trial had
20	been set on the date this occurred, May 4, 1975, the jury
21	trial had been scheduled at that time to take place in
22	Cascade, Idaho, commencing, I think, that very month. I'm
23	wondering if that doesn't, Mr. Robinson, unless nobody has
24	laid any foundation, that there was any other jury trial that

was pending at that time or he was involved in?

MR. ROBINSON: Your Honor, all I can say is to the Court's observation, there is that because there was a constant flow of investigation of so many other death circumstances that all of them in Tom Creech's mind meant being resolved in some kind of jury trial and not necessarily just the immediate one that he was facing here in the State of Idaho.

MR. THOMAS: I would just say in response to that, there's not a shred of evidence anyplace in that case that there were any bodies and if anybody wants to know, we didn't find any there.

MR. ROBINSON: If I may be heard further in that regard.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ROBINSON: By this time, Your Honor, if my count is correct, 12 bodies total have been recovered in other jurisdictions and this was from information given to Bud Mason and Sheriff Palmer on their interrogation and questioning situations held with law enforcement officials from several other states at that time.

THE COURT: Seems to me your objection doesn't go to voluntariness, it goes to question of relevancy and materiality and I'm simply going to hold, for purposes of this hearing, that that statement was not pursuant to interrogation and was a spontaneous statement without being the subject of interrogation by the police and, therefore, required no

MR. ROBINSON: I would be prepared at this time, of course, to submit the testimony of Mr. Creech that it would go directly to the point that he doesn't recall at all ever having made the specific statement just related to by Mr. Mason.

23

24

THE COURT: I think that goes solely to the weight and not to the admissibility.

MR. ROBINSON: Right.

THE COURT: As far as I can see, there being no other jury trial that's been shown to have been pending, or even set at that time regarding "guys" that's been killed, I think it's a reasonable inference that at least goes to the weight; whether it related to the Idaho case, I think those objections would go to weight and not to admissibility.

See if Mr. Boyd is here.

Are you ready to take up the matter of Carol Spaulding's testimony?

MR. BOYD: Yes.

THE COURT: We'll take that up at this time, then.

I'll hear anything further you have to present,
Mr. Boyd, on the question of waiver.

MR. BOYD: I didn't hear you, sir.

THE COURT: The question of waiver by virtue of the testimony she gave in connection with her plea to the accessory after the fact charge.

MR. BOYD: Yes, I've been able to find authority for the proposition that any -- that any testimony that she gave at any prior proceedings would not constitute a waiver of any proposed, or sought testimony in this proceeding.

I've been able to find a Washington case; which I

23

24

think is right in point, Stone against the State of Washington, 534 P.2d 1022. I found an Oregon case that I submit is in point to support my proposition, State against Rawls, 451 P.2d 127. In addition I've found a Federal case, United States against Johnson, 488 F.2d 1206.

I think those cases come out loud and clear on the case of a witness having given testimony at a prior proceeding voluntarily. Being asked to testify at a second trial a witness can claim the privilege against self-incrimination and it cannot be contended that the voluntariness of the prior testimony carries through and constitutes a waiver in the second proceeding.

THE COURT: Wish to respond?

MR. THOMAS: We haven't had an opportunity to look at the cases. The only thing that we have to submit is the case we mentioned this morning, In Re: Master Key litigation and simply reiterate that our position is that since she did testify under oath as to the facts, the same facts that we are concerned with in her testimony here and since all of that was exculpatory, she either waived the privilege by doing that or in the alternative she has no grounds for making a claim of self-incrimination because there wasn't anything incriminating in it unless she now is going to take the position that she perjured herself.

THE COURT: Wish to reply?

MR. BOYD: Well, other than I know that Mr. Thomas probably hasn't had an opportunity to read those cases that I've cited yet, but the Washington case, State against Stone, sets forth what I consider to be some pretty good reasons for the rule for which I'm contending; that being that any testimony or statement she might have given in a previous proceeding had to be taken in the context of that proceeding and she would have no way of knowing at that time what evidence might be sought in this case and she wasn't -- it's my understanding she wasn't under cross-examination or anything in the prior -- at the time she gave a prior statement.

Here, again, we're assuming something, Your Honor, in that I still haven't seen the transcript. By the same token, she might be subject to -- no doubt she will be subject to cross-examination in this case. She just -- it's just an entirely new and different ball game in this proceeding as opposed to the previous case.

The Federal case I cited, Your Honor, even goes to guilty pleas. Can I hand this up to you?

THE COURT: No, I -- yes, I guess I haven't seen that Federal case, that's -- did you give them copies of the Johnson case?

MR. BOYD: No, sir.

THE COURT: Want to argue further after looking at those cases, Mr. Thomas?

MR. THOMAS: No, I don't think so, Your Honor. It appears that there is simply a conflict in the case and this is going to be a matter of first impression with this Court because we don't have an Idaho case, or at least we haven't been able to find one that deals with this question.

I do think the danger of incrimination is rather slight because this witness has testified before as to the very facts and they are not incriminating.

THE COURT: Well, I, of course, ruled on that point this morning and intend to adhere to my ruling; that I feel there is some danger of incrimination and she's entitled to the privilege; unless there's been a waiver.

It seems to me these cases at least purport to state the majority rule and they cite McConnell and other writers on evidence which also support that this is a majority rule.

I would adopt that rule and tend to follow it.

I will hold that there has been no waiver of the privilege,
therfore, to use the testimony of the witness, Carol Spaulding,
the State will have to avail itself of the immunity statute if
it wants to use her testimony.

MR. THOMAS: Well, we intend to do that.

THE COURT: All right. Well, if you tender a proper request, then, under the Statute -- perhaps this is a little premature, but I'm trying to avoid further court hearings.

If a proper request for a grant of immunity under a statute were presented to the Court, would you want to be heard on that or have any objection to the Court granting immunity, Mr. Boyd?

MR. BOYD: No, it's my feeling at this time that if immunity is granted Miss Spaulding will testify. That's our intentions.

THE COURT: I see. From what you know of the case and I appreciate you've had a limited contact with the case, but what you do know of it and what you've been furnished, do you see any basic reason why the Court should not grant immunity in this case as far as you are concerned?

MR. BOYD: No, sir, not so long as we're confined to the events and facts that are within the Court's jurisdiction to grant immunity; anything that happened in the State of Idaho.

THE COURT: I take it -- yes, I'm sure this

Prosecuting Attorney cannot ask for immunity for anything
outside his jurisdiction, so --

MR. BOYD: It will be our position that if

Mr. Robinson calls her on his case and goes into matters

outside the State of Idaho that upon -- we'll claim that that's

privileged and the Court would not have power to grant

immunity in that situation.

THE COURT: I understand that.

It would be my intent, then, upon the presentation

of a proper request, written request for immunity under the statute, to grant the immunity and require the witness to testify, then.

MR. REMAKLUS: To avoid any confusion, Your Honor, you use the phrase "proper written request under the statute".

Which of the two statutes are you referring to?

THE COURT: I'm referring to the only one that requires the intervention of the Court. The first one doesn't require the Court to even take part in it.

MR. REMAKLUS: Thank you,

THE COURT: All right, we'll be in recess until 9:30 tomorrow morning, then.

(Evening recess taken.)